arXiv:1507.01709v1 [math.DS] 7 Jul 2015

Almost Automorphically and Almost Periodically Forced Circle Flows of Almost Periodic Parabolic Equations on S^1

Wenxian Shen
Department of Mathematics and Statistics
Auburn University, Auburn, AL 36849, USA

Yi Wang* and Dun Zhou
School of Mathematical Science
University of Science and Technology of China
Hefei, Anhui, 230026, P. R. China

Abstract

We consider the skew-product semiflow which is generated by a scalar reaction-diffusion equation

$$u_t = u_{xx} + f(t, u, u_x),\ t > 0,\ x \in S^1 = \mathbb{R}/2\pi\mathbb{Z},$$

where f is uniformly almost periodic in t. The structure of the minimal set M is thoroughly investigated under the assumption that the center space $V^c(M)$ associated with M is no more than 2-dimensional. Such situation naturally occurs while, for instance, M is hyperbolic or uniquely ergodic. It is shown in this paper that M is a 1-cover of the hull $H(f)$ provided that M is hyperbolic (equivalently, $\dim V^c(M) = 0$). If $\dim V^c(M) = 1$ (resp. $\dim V^c(M) = 2$ with $\dim V^u(M)$ being odd), then either M is an almost 1-cover of $H(f)$ and topologically conjugate to a minimal flow in $\mathbb{R} \times H(f)$; or M can be (resp. residually) embedded into an almost periodically (resp. almost automorphically) forced circle-flow $S^1 \times H(f)$.

When $f(t, u, u_x) = f(t, u, -u_x)$ (which includes the case $f = f(t, u)$), it is proved that any minimal set M is an almost 1-cover of $H(f)$. In particular, any hyperbolic minimal set M is a 1-cover of $H(f)$. Furthermore, if $\dim V^c(M) = 1$, then M is either a 1-cover of $H(f)$ or is topologically conjugate to a minimal flow in $\mathbb{R} \times H(f)$. For the general spatially-dependent nonlinearity $f = f(t, x, u, u_x)$, we show that any stable or linearly stable minimal invariant set M is residually embedded into $\mathbb{R}^2 \times H(f)$.

1 Introduction

In this paper we investigate the large time behavior of bounded solutions for the scalar reaction-diffusion equations on the circle

$$u_t = u_{xx} + f(t, x, u, u_x),\ t > 0,\ x \in S^1 = \mathbb{R}/2\pi\mathbb{Z}, \tag{1.1}$$

---

[*] Partially supported by NSF of China No.11371338, 11471305, Wu Wen-Tsun Key Laboratory and the Fundamental Research Funds for the Central Universities.

where $f : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ is C^3, $f(t, x + 2\pi, u, u_x) = f(t, x, u, u_x)$, and $f(t, x, u, p)$ together with all its derivatives (up to order 3) are almost periodic in t uniformly for (x, u, p) in compact subsets.

To carry out our study for the non-autonomous equation (1.1), we will embed it into a skew-product semiflow in the following way. The function f generates a family $\{f_\tau | \tau \in \mathbb{R}\}$ in the space of continuous functions $C(\mathbb{R} \times S^1 \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R})$ equipped with the compact open topology. Here $f_\tau(t, x, u, p) = f(t + \tau, x, u, p)(\tau \in \mathbb{R})$ denotes the time-translation of f. Let $H(f)$, called the hull of f, be the closure of $\{f_\tau | \tau \in \mathbb{R}\}$ in the compact open topology. By the Ascoli–Arzela theorem, $H(f)$ is a compact metric space and every $g \in H(f)$ is uniformly almost periodic and has the same regularity as f. The action of time-translation $g \cdot t \equiv g_t \, (g \in H(f))$ defines a compact minimal flow on $H(f)$ ([23,28]). This means that $H(f)$ is the only nonempty compact subset of itself that is invariant under the flow $g \cdot t$. By introducing the hull $H(f)$, equation (1.1) gives rise to a family of equations associated to each $g \in H(f)$,

$$u_t = u_{xx} + g(t, x, u, u_x), \qquad t > 0, \quad x \in S^1. \tag{1.2}$$

Let X be the fractional power space associated with the operator $u \to -u_{xx} : H^2(S^1) \to L^2(S^1)$ such that the embedding relation $X \hookrightarrow C^1(S^1)$ is satisfied. For any $u \in X$, (1.2) admits (locally) a unique solution $\varphi(t, \cdot; u, g)$ in X with $\varphi(0, \cdot, u, g) = u(\cdot)$. This solution also continuously depends on $g \in H(f)$ and $u \in X$. Therefore, (1.2) defines a (local) skew product semiflow Π^t on $X \times H(f)$:

$$\Pi^t(u, g) = (\varphi(t, \cdot; u, g), g \cdot t), \quad t > 0. \tag{1.3}$$

Following from the work in [12] and the standard a priori estimates for parabolic equations, it is known that if $\varphi(t, \cdot; u, g)(u \in X)$ is bounded in X in the existence interval of the solution, then u is a globally defined classical solution. In the terminology of the skew-product semiflow (1.3), the study of dynamics of (1.2) gives rise to the problem of understanding the ω-limit set $\omega(u, g)$ of the bounded semi-orbit $\Pi^t(u, g)$ in $X \times H(f)$. Note that, for any $\delta > 0$, $\{\varphi(t, \cdot; u, g) : t \geq \delta\}$ is relatively compact in X. As a consequence, $\omega(u, g)$ is a nonempty connected compact subset of $X \times H(f)$. It is further known that Π^t on the ω-limit set $\omega(u, g)$ has a unique continuous backward time extension (see, e.g. [11]).

In the case where f is independent of t (i.e., the autonomous case) or, equivalently, if $H(f) = \{f\}$, Fiedler and Mallet-Paret [10] have shown the well-known Poincaré-Bendixson type Theorem for system (1.1). It states that any ω-limit set $\omega(u)$ is either a single periodic orbit or it consists of equilibria and connecting (homoclinic and heterclinic) orbits. In particular, if f does not depend on x (also called spatially-homogeneous), i.e., $f = f(u, u_x)$, the solution semiflow commutes with the natural action of shifting $x \in S^1$. Due to such S^1-equivariance, Massatt [17] and Matano [19] showed independently that any periodic orbit is a rotating wave $u = \phi(x - ct)$ for some 2π-periodic function ϕ and constant c; and hence, $\omega(u)$ is either itself a single rotating wave, or a set of equilibria differing only by phase shift in x. Recently, transversality of the stable and unstable manifolds of hyperbolic equilibria and periodic orbits for autonomous system (1.2) has been established in [5, 15]. Based on this, Joly and Raugel [16] have proved the generic Morse-Smale property for the system.

In the case that f is time-periodic with period 1 (equivalently, $H(f)$ is homeomorphic to the circle $\mathcal{T}^1 = \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$), Chen and Matano [3] proved that for $f = f(t, u)$ independent of x and u_x, the ω-limit set $\omega(u)$ of any bounded solutions consists of a unique time-periodic orbit with period 1. If $f = f(t, u, u_x)$ is independent of x, Fiedler and Sandstede [22] showed that the ω-limit set $\omega(u)$ can be viewed as a subset of the two-dimensional torus $\mathcal{T}^1 \times S^1$ carrying a linear flow. However, one can not expect a simple asymptotic behavior of solutions for the general nonlinearity $f = f(t, x, u, u_x)$. As a matter of fact, Fiedler and Sandstede [22] have further pointed out that chaotic behavior exhibited by any time-periodic planar vector field can also be found in certain time-periodic equation with the nonlinearity $f = f(t, x, u, u_x)$. On the other hand, Tereščák [29] proved that any ω-limit set of the Poincaré map generated by the time-periodic system with $f = f(t, x, u, u_x)$ can be imbedded into a 2-dimensional plane.

In the language of skew-product semiflows, Tereščák's result [29] implies that each ω-limit set $\omega(u, g)$ (with $g \in H(f) \sim \mathcal{T}^1$) of (1.3) can be imbedded into $\mathbb{R}^2 \times H(f)$ (see Definition 2.3). In particular, in the spatially-homogeneous case that $f = f(t, u, u_x)$ is time-periodic, the result by Fiedler and Sandstede [22] entails that each ω-limit set $\omega(u, g)$ can be imbedded into the periodically-forced circle flow $S^1 \times H(f)$.

In nature, large quantities of systems evolve influenced by external effects which are roughly, but not exactly periodic, or under environmental forcing which exhibits different, noncommensurate periods. As a consequence, models with such time dependence are characterized more appropriately by quasi-periodic or almost periodic equations or even by certain nonautonomous equations rather than by periodic ones. Consequently, time non-periodic equations have been attracting more attention recently.

The current paper is devoted to the study of dynamics of time almost-periodic scalar parabolic equations with periodic boundary conditions. For separated boundary conditions, one can refer to a series of work by Shen and Yi [24–28]. Among others, they [24, 26] have proved that any minimal invariant set M of the skew-product semiflow is an almost 1-1 cover of $H(f)$; and hence, M is an almost automorphic minimal set. In particular, if M is hyperbolic, then M is a 1-1 cover of $H(f)$ (see [25]). As in [24–28], the zero number properties developed in [1, 18] play important roles in their studies. With periodic boundary condition the zero number can still be applied. It does not yield the almost automorphy of the minimal sets in general, however. To the best of our knowledge, the structures of the minimal sets have been hardly studied for scalar parabolic equations, even for the spatially-homogeneous system $f = f(t, u, u_x)$, with periodic boundary condition (see [8, 30] for some partial related results). As a consequence, we will try to initiate our research on this aspect.

We first consider the spatially-homogeneous case of $f = f(t, u, u_x)$. The structure of the minimal set M for (1.3) will be thoroughly investigated under the assumptions that the center space $V^c(M)$ associated with M is no more than 2-dimensional. Such situation naturally occurs, for instance, while M is uniquely ergodic (see Theorem 3.2(1)) or M is hyperbolic. We denote by $V^u(M)$ the unstable space associated to M. Among others, we will prove

- *If* $\dim V^c(M) = 2$ *with* $\dim V^u(M)$ *being odd, then either*
  - (i) *M is an almost 1-cover of $H(f)$ and topologically conjugate to a minimal flow in $\mathbb{R} \times H(f)$; or*
  - (ii) *M can be residually embedded into an almost automorphically forced circle-flow $S^1 \times H(f)$ (see Theorem 3.1(1)).*

- *If* $\dim V^c(M) = 1$*, then either*
  - (i) *M is an almost 1-cover of $H(f)$ and the dynamics on M is topologically conjugate to a minimal flow in $\mathbb{R} \times H(f)$; or*
  - (ii) *M is normally hyperbolic and can be embedded into an almost periodically forced circle-flow $S^1 \times H(f)$ (see Theorem 3.1(2)).*

- *If* $\dim V^c(M) = 0$ *(equivalently, M is called hyperbolic), then M is a 1-cover of $H(f)$ and the dynamics on M is topologically conjugate to an almost periodic minimal flow in $\mathbb{R} \times H(f)$ (see Theorem 4.1(4)).*

- *Any spatially homogeneous minimal set M is an almost 1-cover of $H(f)$ and the dynamics on M is topologically conjugate to an almost automorphic minimal flow in $\mathbb{R} \times H(f)$ (see Theorem 4.1(1)).*

- *If M is linearly stable, then M is spatially homogeneous and hence is an almost 1-cover of $H(f)$ (see Theorem 4.1(2)).*

We also remark that, for $f = f(t, u, u_x)$, if M is a spatially homogeneous minimal set or uniquely ergodic, then one may obtain the oddness of $\dim V^u(M)$ (see Theorem 3.2). In general, it remains open whether $\dim V^u(M)$ is odd provided that $\dim V^u(M) \neq 0$.

Comparing with the results in [25,27] for separated boundary conditions, one can still observe here the 1-cover property of the hyperbolic minimal sets; while for the case $\dim V^c(M) = 1$, we obtained the new phenomena for periodic boundary conditions that M can be embedded into an almost periodically forced circle flow $S^1 \times H(f)$, which is a natural generalization of the rotating waves in [17,19] (autonomous cases) and the two-dimensional torus flow in [22] (time-periodic cases) to time almost-periodic systems. It also deserves to point out that an almost periodically forced circle flow could still be very complicated (See Huang and Yi [13] and the references therein). The new phenomena we discovered here reinforces the appearance of the almost periodically forced circle flow in the infinite-dimensional dynamical systems generated by certain evolutionary equations.

When $f(t,u,p)=f(t,u,-p)$ in (1.1) (which includes the case $f=f(t,u)$), more information of the structure of a minimal set for (1.3) can be obtained. We will show, in this case,

- *Any minimal set M is an almost 1-cover of $H(f)$. Moreover, M is a 1-cover of $H(f)$ provided that M is hyperbolic or $\dim V^c(M)=1$ (see Theorem 4.2).*

Thus, we have also generalized the convergence results in [3] from time-periodic systems to time almost-periodic systems.

Finally, we will consider the general nonlinearity $f=f(t,x,u,u_x)$. We will show

- *Any linearly stable or stable minimal set M is residually embedded (see Definition 2.3) into $\mathbb{R}^2\times H(f)$. In particular, the ω-limit set of any uniformly stable bounded trajectory can be embedded into $\mathbb{R}^2\times H(f)$ (see Theorem 5.1).*

The above embedding property for the minimal sets partially extends the results of Fiedler and Mallet-Paret [10] (autonomous cases) and Tereščák [29] (time-periodic cases) to time almost-periodic systems.

The paper is organized as follows. In section 2, we agree on some notation, give relevant definitions and preliminary results, including the Floquet bundles theory and the invariant manifolds theory for skew-product semiflows, which will be important to our proofs. In Section 3, we will investigate the skew-product semiflow (1.3) generated by (1.2) with $f=f(t,u,u_x)$. The structure of the minimal set M is investigated under the assumption that $\dim V^c(M)=1$, or $\dim V^c(M)=2$ with $\dim V^u(M)$ being odd (Theorem 3.1). The new phenomena is found in this section that M can be embedded into an almost periodically forced circle flow $S^1\times H(f)$. We also obtain in this section that the unique ergodicity of M implies that $\dim V^c(M)\le 2$. In Section 4, we focus on the (almost) 1-cover property of minimal sets for (1.2) with $f=f(t,u,u_x)$. In particular, when $f=f(t,u)$, any minimal set M is an almost 1-cover. In Section 5, we study the imbeding properties of linearly stable and stable minimal sets of (1.3) in the general case $f=f(t,x,u,u_x)$.

2 Notations and preliminaries results

In this section, we summarize some preliminary materials to be used in later sections. We start by summarizing some lifting properties of compact dynamical systems. Next, we give a brief review about almost periodic (automorphic) functions. We then present some basic properties of zero numbers of solutions for linear parabolic equations. Finally, we present some basic properties about Floquet bundles and invariant subspaces of linear parabolic equations on S^1 and some basic properties about invariant manifolds of nonlinear parabolic equations on S^1.

2.1 Lifting properties of compact dynamical systems

Let Y be a compact metric space with metric d_Y, and $\sigma: Y\times\mathbb{R}\to Y, (y,t)\mapsto y\cdot t$ be a continuous flow on Y, denoted by (Y,σ) or $(Y,\mathbb{R})$. A subset $S\subset Y$ is *invariant* if $\sigma_t(S)=S$ for every $t\in\mathbb{R}$.

A subset $S \subset Y$ is called *minimal* if it is compact, invariant and the only non-empty compact invariant subset of it is itself. Every compact and σ-invariant set contains a minimal subset and a subset S is minimal if and only if every trajectory is dense. The continuous flow (Y, σ) is called to be *recurrent* or *minimal* if Y is minimal. We say that the flow (Y, σ) is *distal* when, for each pair y_1, y_2 of different elements of Y, there is a $\delta > 0$ such that $d_Y(y_1 \cdot t, y_2 \cdot t) > \delta$ for every $t \in \mathbb{R}$.

If $(Z, \mathbb{R})$ is another continuous flow, *a flow homomorphism* from $(Z, \mathbb{R})$ to (Y, σ) is a continuous mapping p from Z to Y such that $p(z \cdot t) = p(z) \cdot t$ for all $z \in Z$ and $t \in \mathbb{R}$. An onto flow homomorphism is called a *flow epimorphism*. Moreover, p is a *flow epimorphism* if (Y, σ) is minimal. The following lemma is adopted from [28] and will play important roles in our forthcoming sections.

Lemma 2.1. *Let $p : (Z, \mathbb{R}) \to (Y, \mathbb{R})$ be an epimorphism of flows, where Z, Y are compact metric spaces. Then the set*

$$\begin{aligned} Y' = \{ y_0 \in Y | &\textit{for any } u_0 \in p^{-1}(y_0),\ y \in Y \textit{ and any sequence } \{t_i\} \subset \mathbb{R} \textit{ with } y \cdot t_i \to \\ & y_0,\ \textit{there is a sequence } \{u_i\} \in p^{-1}(y) \textit{ such that } u_i \cdot t_i \to u_0 \} \end{aligned}$$

is residual and invariant. In particular, if $(Z, \mathbb{R})$ is minimal and distal, then $Y' = Y$.

Proof. See [28, Lemma I.2.16]. □

Hereafter, we always assume that Y is minimal and distal.

Let X, Y be metric spaces and (Y, σ) be a compact flow (called the base flow). Let also $\mathbb{R}^+ = \{t \in \mathbb{R} : t \geq 0\}$. A skew-product semiflow $\Pi^t : X \times Y \to X \times Y$ is a semiflow of the following form

$$\Pi^t(u, y) = (\varphi(t, u, y), y \cdot t), \quad t \geq 0,\ (u, y) \in X \times Y, \tag{2.1}$$

satisfying (i) $\Pi^0 = \mathrm{Id}_X$ and (ii) the co-cycle property: $\varphi(t + s, u, y) = \varphi(s, \varphi(t, u, y), y \cdot t)$ for each $(u, y) \in X \times Y$ and $s, t \in \mathbb{R}^+$. A subset $A \subset X \times Y$ is *positively invariant* if $\Pi^t(A) \subset A$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}^+$. The *forward orbit* of any $(u, y) \in X \times Y$ is defined by $\mathcal{O}^+(u, y) = \{\Pi^t(u, y) : t \geq 0\}$, and the *$\omega$-limit set* of (u, y) is defined by $\omega(u, y) = \{(\hat{u}, \hat{y}) \in X \times Y : \Pi^{t_n}(u, y) \to (\hat{u}, \hat{y}) (n \to \infty)$ for some sequence $t_n \to \infty\}$.

A *flow extension* of a skew-product semiflow Π^t is a continuous skew-product flow $\hat{\Pi}^t$ such that $\hat{\Pi}^t(u, y) = \Pi^t(u, y)$ for each $(u, y) \in X \times Y$ and $t \in \mathbb{R}^+$. A compact positively invariant subset is said to admit *a flow extension* if the semiflow restricted to it does. Actually, a compact positively invariant set $K \subset X \times Y$ admits a flow extension if every point in K admits a unique backward orbit which remains inside the set K (see [28, part II]). A compact positively invariant set $K \subset X \times Y$ for Π^t is called *minimal* if it does not contain any other nonempty compact positively invariant set than itself.

Let $K \subset X \times Y$ be a positively invariant set for Π^t which admits a flow extension. Let also $p : X \times Y \to Y$ be the natural projection. Then p is a flow homomorphism for the flows $(K, \mathbb{R})$ and (Y, σ). Moreover, $K \subset X \times Y$ is called an *almost* 1-*cover* (1-*cover*) of Y if $\mathrm{card}(p^{-1}(y) \cap K) = 1$ for at least one $y \in Y$ (for any $y \in Y$).

Now let us recall some definitions concerning the stability of the trajectories of the semiflows.

Definition 2.1. Let d_X be the metric on X.

(1) (Stability) A forward orbit $\mathcal{O}^+(u_0, y_0)$ of (2.1) is said to be *stable* if for every $\varepsilon > 0$ and $s \geq 0$, there is a $\delta = \delta(\varepsilon, s) > 0$ such that, for every $u \in X$, if $d_X(\varphi(s, u_0, y_0), \varphi(s, u, y_0)) \leq \delta$ then

$$d_X(\varphi(t+s, u_0, y_0), \varphi(t+s, u, y_0)) < \varepsilon \text{ for each } t \geq 0.$$

A minimal set M is called *stable* if $\mathcal{O}^+(u_*, y_*)$ is stable for any point $(u_*, y_*) \in M$;

(2) (Uniform stability) A forward orbit $\mathcal{O}^+(u_0, y_0)$ of (2.1) is said to be *uniformly stable* if for every $\varepsilon > 0$ there is a $\delta = \delta(\varepsilon) > 0$, called the *modulus of uniform stability*, such that, for every $u \in X$, if $s \geq 0$ and $d_X(\varphi(s, u_0, y_0), \varphi(s, u, y_0)) \leq \delta(\varepsilon)$ then

$$d_X(\varphi(t+s, u_0, y_0), \varphi(t+s, u, y_0)) < \varepsilon \text{ for each } t \geq 0.$$

Remark 2.1. If $\mathcal{O}^+(u, y)$ is relatively compact and uniformly stable, then for every point $(u_*, y_*) \in \omega(u, y)$, $\mathcal{O}^+(u_*, y_*)$ is uniformly stable with the same modulus of uniform stability as that of the $\mathcal{O}^+(u, y)$ (see [23, 28]).

We now assume in additional that X is a Banach space. Assume also that the cocycle φ in (2.1) is $C^{1+\alpha}$ $(0 < \alpha \leq 1)$ for $u \in X$, that is, φ is C^1 in u, and the derivative φ_u is continuous in $y \in Y$, $t > 0$ and is C^α in u; and moreover, for any $v \in X$,

$$\varphi_u(t, u, y)v \to v \quad \text{as} \quad t \to 0^+,$$

uniformly for (u, y) in compact subsets of $X \times Y$. Let $K \subset X \times Y$ be a compact, positively invariant set which admits a flow extension. Define $\Phi(t, u, y) = \varphi_u(t, u, y)$ for $(u, y) \in K$, $t \geq 0$. Then the operator Φ generates a linear skew-product semiflow Ψ on $(X \times K, \mathbb{R}^+)$ associated with (2.1) over K as follows:

$$\Psi(t, v, (u, y)) = (\Phi(t, u, y)v, \Pi^t(u, y)), \ t \geq 0, \ (u, y) \in K, \ v \in X. \tag{2.2}$$

For each $(u, y) \in K$, define the Lyapunov exponent $\lambda(u, y) = \limsup\limits_{t \to \infty} \frac{\ln ||\Phi(t, u, y)||}{t}$, where $|| \cdot ||$ is the operator norm of $\Phi(t, u, y)$. We call the number $\lambda_K = \sup_{(u,y) \in K} \lambda(u, y)$ the *upper Lyapunov exponent* on K.

Definition 2.2. K is said to be *linearly stable*, if $\lambda_K \leq 0$.

Definition 2.3. Let X_1 be another Banach space. A minimal subset $K \subset X \times Y$ is said to be *residually embedded* into $X_1 \times Y$, if there exist a residual invariant set $Y_* \subset Y$ and a flow $\hat{\Pi}^t$ defined on some subset $\hat{K} \subset X_1 \times Y_*$ such that the flow $\Pi^t|_{K \cap p^{-1}(Y_*)}$ is topologically conjugate to $\hat{\Pi}^t$ on $\hat{K}$. Moreover, when $Y_* = Y$, we call K is *embedded* into $X_1 \times Y$.

2.2 Almost periodic and almost automorphic functions

A function $f \in C(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R})$ is *almost periodic* if, for any $\varepsilon > 0$, the set $T(\varepsilon) := \{\tau : |f(t+\tau) - f(t)| < \varepsilon, \forall t \in \mathbb{R}\}$ is relatively dense in $\mathbb{R}$. f is *almost automorphic* if for every $\{t'_k\} \subset \mathbb{R}$ there is a subsequence $\{t_k\}$ and a function $g : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ such that $f(t+t_k) \to g(t)$ and $g(t-t_k) \to f(t)$ point wise. Let $D \subseteq \mathbb{R}^m$ be a subset of $\mathbb{R}^m$. A continuous function $f : \mathbb{R} \times D \to \mathbb{R}; (t, w) \mapsto f(t, w)$, is said to be *admissible* if $f(t, w)$ is bounded and uniformly continuous on $\mathbb{R} \times K$ for any compact subset $K \subset D$. A function $f \in C(\mathbb{R} \times D, \mathbb{R})(D \subset \mathbb{R}^m)$ is *uniformly almost periodic (automorphic) in* t, if f is both admissible and almost periodic (automorphic) in $t \in \mathbb{R}$.

Let $f \in C(\mathbb{R} \times D, \mathbb{R})(D \subset \mathbb{R}^m)$ be admissible. Then $H(f) = \mathrm{cl}\{f \cdot \tau : \tau \in \mathbb{R}\}$ is called the *hull of* f, where $f \cdot \tau(t, \cdot) = f(t+\tau, \cdot)$ and the closure is taken under the compact open topology. Moreover, $H(f)$ is compact and metrizable under the compact open topology (see [23,28]). The time translation $g \cdot t$ of $g \in H(f)$ induces a natural flow on $H(f)$ (cf. [23]).

Remark 2.2. If f is a uniformly almost periodic function in t, then $H(f)$ is always *minimal and distal*. Moreover, every $g \in H(f)$ is uniformly almost periodic function (see, e.g. [28]).

2.3 Zero number properties of linear parabolic equations on S^1

As the zero number is a very important tool in our proofs, we provide in this section the definition of the zero number and list some related properties.

Given a C^1-smooth function $u : S^1 \to \mathbb{R}^1$, the zero number of u is defined as

$$z(u(\cdot)) = \mathrm{card}\{x \in S^1 | u(x) = 0\}.$$

We now list some properties of the zero number (see, e.g. [1,18] or [22, Lemma 2.2]).

Lemma 2.2. *Consider the linear system*

$$\begin{cases} \varphi_t = \varphi_{xx} + b\varphi_x + c\varphi, & x \in S^1, \\ \varphi_0 = \varphi(0, \cdot) \in H^1(S^1), \end{cases} \tag{2.3}$$

where the coefficients b, c *are allowed to depend on* t *and* x *such that* $b, b_t, b_x, c \in L^\infty_{loc}$. *Let* $\varphi(t, x)$ *be a nontrivial solution of* (2.3). *Then the following properties holds.*

(a) $z(\varphi(t, \cdot)) < \infty, \forall t > 0$ *and is non-increasing in* t.

(b) $z(\varphi(t, \cdot))$ *can drop only at* t_0 *such that* $\varphi(t_0)$ *has a multiple zero in* S^1.

(c) $z(\varphi(t, \cdot))$ *can drop only finite many times,and there exists a* $T > 0$ *such that* $\varphi(t, \cdot)$ *has only simple zeros in* S^1 *as* $t \geq T$ *(hence* $z(\varphi(t)) =$ *constant as* $t \geq T$*).*

Lemma 2.3. *For any* $g \in H(f)$, *Let* $\varphi(t, \cdot; u, g)$ *and* $\varphi(t, \cdot; \hat{u}, g)$ *be distinct solutions of* (1.2) *on* $\mathbb{R}^+$. *Then*

(a) $z(\varphi(t, \cdot; u, g) - \varphi(t, \cdot; \hat{u}, g)) < \infty$ *for* $t > 0$ *and is non-increasing in* t*;*

(b) *$z(\varphi(t,\cdot;u,g)) - \varphi(t,\cdot;\hat{u},g)))$ strictly decreases at t_0 such that the function $\varphi(t_0,\cdot;u,g)) - \varphi(t_0,\cdot;\hat{u},g)$ has a multiple zero in S^1;*

(c) *$z(\varphi(t,\cdot;u,g)) - \varphi(t,\cdot;\hat{u},g)))$ can drop only finite many times, and there exists a $T > 0$ such that*

$$z(\varphi(t,\cdot;u,g)) - \varphi(t,\cdot;\hat{u},g))) \equiv \text{constant}$$

for all $t \geq T$.

Proof. Denote $u(t,x) = \varphi(t,x;u,g)$ and $\hat{u}(t,x) = \varphi(t,x;\hat{u},g)$. Let $v(t,x) = u(t,x) - \hat{u}(t,x)$ is a nontrivial solution of the linear parabolic equation (2.3), where

$$b(t,x) = \int_0^1 \frac{\partial g}{\partial p}(t,x,u(t,x),su_x(t,x) + (1-s)\hat{u}_x(t,x))ds,$$

$$c(t,x) = \int_0^1 \frac{\partial g}{\partial u}(t,x,su(t,x) + (1-s)\hat{u}(t,x),\hat{u}_x(t,x))ds.$$

Then the results directly follows from Lemma 2.2. □

Lemma 2.4. *Fix $g,\ g_0 \in H(f)$. Let $(u^i,g) \in P^{-1}(g), (u_0^i,g_0) \in P^{-1}(g_0)(i=1,\ 2,\ u^1 \neq u^2,\ u_0^1 \neq u_0^2)$ be such that $\Pi^t(u^i,g)$ is defined on $\mathbb{R}^+$ and $\Pi^t(u_0^i,g_0)$ is defined on $\mathbb{R}$. If there exists a sequence $t_n \to +\infty$ (resp. $s_n \to -\infty$) as $n \to \infty$, such that $\Pi^{t_n}(u^i,g) \to (u_0^i,g_0)$ (resp. $\Pi^{s_n}(u^i,g) \to (u_0^i,g_0)$) as $n \to \infty (i=1,2)$, then*

$$z(\varphi(t,\cdot;u_0^1,g_0) - \varphi(t,\cdot;u_0^2,g_0)) \equiv \text{constant},$$

for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$.

Proof. We only prove the case of $t_n \to +\infty$. The case of $s_n \to -\infty$ is similar. By virtue of Lemma 2.3(c), there exists a $T > 0$ and integer $N_1 > 0$ such that $z(\varphi(t,\cdot;u^1,g) - \varphi(t,\cdot;u^2,g)) = N_1$, for all $t \geq T$. Fix $t_0 \in \mathbb{R}$, so that $\varphi(t_0,\cdot;u_0^1,g_0) - \varphi(t_0,\cdot;u_0^2,g_0)$ only has simple zeros. Note that with $\Pi^{t_n}(u^i,g) \to (u_0^i,g_0)(i=1,2)$ and the continuity of $z(\cdot)$, one has $z(\varphi(t_n+t_0,\cdot;u^1,g) - \varphi(t_n+t_0,\cdot;u^2,g)) = z(\varphi(t_0,\cdot;u_0^1,g_0) - \varphi(t_0,\cdot;u_0^2,g_0))$ for all n sufficiently large. Consequently, $z(\varphi(t_0,\cdot;u_0^1,g_0) - \varphi(t_0,\cdot;u_0^2,g_0)) = N_1$. By Lemma 2.3(b)-(c) and the arbitrariness of t_0, we have $z(\varphi(t,\cdot;u_0^1,g_0) - \varphi(t,\cdot;u_0^2,g_0)) = N_1$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$. □

2.4 Floquet bundles and invarsiant subspaces for linear parabolic equations on S^1

Consider the following linear parabolic equation:

$$\psi_t = \psi_{xx} + a(x,\omega\cdot t)\psi_x + b(x,\omega\cdot t)\psi,\ \ t > 0,\ x \in S^1 = \mathbb{R}/2\pi\mathbb{Z}, \tag{2.4}$$

where $\omega \in \Omega$, $\omega \cdot t$ is a flow on a compact metric space Ω, $a,b : S^1 \times \Omega \to \mathbb{R}^1$ is a continuous, and $a^\omega(t,x) = a(x,\omega\cdot t)$, $b^\omega(t,x) = b(x,\omega\cdot t)$ are Hölder continuous in t.

Throughout this subsection, X is as in the introduction, that is, X is the fractional power space associated with the operator $u \to -u_{xx} : H^2(S^1) \to L^2(S^1)$ such that the embedding relation $X \hookrightarrow C^1(S^1)$ is satisfied. For any $w \in L^2(S^1)$, $\psi(t, x, w, \omega)$ denotes the solution of (2.4) with $\psi(0, x, w, \omega) = w(x), x \in S^1$. Then we have the following lemma.

Lemma 2.5. (i) *There is a sequence* $\{w_n, \tilde{w}_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty} \cup \{w_0\}$, $w_0, w_n, \tilde{w}_n : S^1 \times \Omega \to \mathbb{R}^1$, *such that* $w_0(\cdot, \omega), w_n(\cdot, \omega), \tilde{w}_n(\cdot, \omega) \in C^{1,\gamma}(S^1)$ *for any* γ *with* $0 \le \gamma < 1$, *and* $\|w_0(\cdot, \omega)\|_{L^2(S^1)} = \|w_n(\cdot, \omega)\|_{L^2(S^1)} = \|\tilde{w}_n(\cdot, \omega)\|_{L^2(S^1)} = 1$ *for any* $\omega \in \Omega$. $\{w_n(\cdot, \omega), \tilde{w}_n(\cdot, \omega)\}_{n=1}^{\infty} \cup \{w_0(\cdot, \omega)\}$ *forms a Floquet basis of* $L^2(S^1)$, $z(w_0(\cdot, \omega)) = 0$ *and* $z(w_n(\cdot, \omega)) = 2n$ $(z(\tilde{w}_n(\cdot, \omega)) = 2n)$ *for all* $\omega \in \Omega$.

(ii) *Let* $W_0(\omega) = \mathrm{span}\{w_0(\cdot, \omega)\}$ *and* $W_n(\omega) = \mathrm{span}\{w_n(\cdot, \omega), \tilde{w}_n(\cdot, \omega)\}$, $n = 1, 2, \cdots$. *Then*

$$\begin{aligned} \bigoplus_{i=n_1}^{n_2} W_i(\omega) \quad &= \{w \in L^2(S^1) | \psi(t, \cdot; w, \omega) \text{ is exponentially bounded in } L^2(S^1), \\ &\qquad \text{and } 2n_1 \le z(\psi(t, \cdot; w, \omega)) \le 2n_2 \text{ for all } t \in \mathbb{R}^1\} \cup \{0\} \end{aligned}$$

for any n_1, n_2 *with* $n_1 \le n_2$.

(iii) *Suppose* $w = c_0^0 w_0(x, \omega) + \Sigma_{n=1}^{\infty}(c_n^0 w_n(x, \omega) + \tilde{c}_n^0 \tilde{w}_n(x, \omega))$. *Then*

$$\psi(t, x, w, \omega) = c_0(t) w_0(x, \omega \cdot t) + \Sigma_{n=1}^{\infty}(c_n(t) w_n(x, \omega \cdot t) + \tilde{c}_n(t) \tilde{w}_n(x, \omega \cdot t)), \tag{2.5}$$

where $c_0(t)$, $c_n(t)$, $\tilde{c}_n(t)$ *are* C^1 *functions with* $c_0(0) = c_0^0$, $c_n(0) = c_n^0$, $\tilde{c}_n(0) = \tilde{c}_n^0$.

(iv) *Define* $\Lambda(\cdot) : \Omega \to L(L^2(S^1), l^2)$ *by* $\Lambda(\omega) w_0 = \{c_0^0\} \cup \{c_n^0, \tilde{c}_n^0\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$, *where* $w_0 = c_0^0 w_0(x, \omega) + \Sigma_{n=1}^{\infty}(c_n^0 w_n(x, \omega) + \tilde{c}_n^0 \tilde{w}_n(x, \omega))$. *Then* $\Lambda(\omega \cdot t)\psi(t, x, w_0, \omega) = \{c_0(t)\} \cup \{c_n(t), \tilde{c}_n(t)\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$. *Moreover,* Λ *is continuous,* $\Lambda(\omega)$ *is an isomorphism for each* $\omega \in \Omega$, *and there are positive constants* K_1, K_2 *which are independent of* ω *such that*

$$\|\Lambda(\omega)\| \le K_1 \quad \text{and} \quad \|\Lambda^{-1}(\omega)\| \le K_2.$$

(v) (Exponential Separation) *Let* $Z_k^+(\omega) = \bigoplus_{i=0}^{k} W_i(\omega)$ *and* $Z_k^-(\omega) = \bigoplus_{i=k+1}^{\infty} W_i(\omega)$. *There are constants* $K > 0, \mu > 0$ *such that if* $\psi(t, \cdot; v_0, \omega) \in Z_k^+(\omega \cdot t)$ *and* $\psi(t, \cdot; w_0, \omega) \in Z_k^-(\omega \cdot t)$ *are nontrivial solutions for* (2.4), *then*

$$\frac{||\psi(t, \cdot; w_0, \omega)||}{||\psi(t, \cdot; v_0, \omega)||} \le K e^{-\mu t} \frac{||w_0||}{||v_0||}, \quad \text{for all } t \ge 0, w_0 \in Z_k^-(\omega), v_0 \in Z_k^+(\omega).$$

Proof. See [8, Section 9]. □

Now we recall the conception of exponential dichotomy (ED) and Sacker-Sell spectrum.

Let $\Psi(t, \omega) : X \to X$ be the evolution operator generated by (2.4), that is, the evolution operator of the following equation:

$$v' = A(\omega \cdot t) v, \quad t > 0, \, \omega \in \Omega, \, v \in X, \tag{2.6}$$

where $A(\omega)v = v_{xx} + a(x,\omega)v_x + b(x,\omega)v$, and $\omega \cdot t$ is as in (2.4).

Let $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ and define $\Pi^t_\lambda : X \times \Omega \to X \times \Omega$ by

$$\Pi^t_\lambda(v,\omega) = (\Psi_\lambda(t,\omega)v, \omega \cdot t), \tag{2.7}$$

where $\Psi_\lambda(t,\omega) = e^{-\lambda t}\Psi(t,\omega)$. It is easy to verify that Π^t_λ is also a linear skew-product semiflow on $X \times \Omega$. We say Ψ_λ admits an *exponential dichotomy over* Ω if there exist $K > 0$, $\alpha > 0$ and continuous projections $P(\omega) : X \to X$ such that for all $\omega \in \Omega$, $\Psi_\lambda(t,\omega)|_{R(P(\omega))} : R(P(\omega)) \to R(P(\omega \cdot t))$ is an isomorphism satisfying $\Psi_\lambda(t,\omega)P(\omega) = P(\omega \cdot t)\Psi_\lambda(t,\omega)$, $t \in \mathbb{R}^+$; moreover,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Psi_\lambda(t,\omega)(I - P(\omega))\| &\le Ke^{-\alpha t}, \quad t \ge 0, \\ \|\Psi_\lambda(t,\omega)P(\omega)\| &\le Ke^{\alpha t}, \quad t \le 0. \end{aligned}$$

Here $R(P(\omega))$ is the range of $P(\omega)$. We call

$$\sigma(\Omega) = \{\lambda \in \mathbb{R} : \Pi^t_\lambda \text{ has no exponential dichotomy over } \Omega\}$$

the *Sacker-Sell spectrum* of (2.4) or (2.6). If Ω is *compact and connected*, then the Sacker-Sell spectrum $\sigma(\Omega) = \cup_{k=0}^\infty I_k$, where $I_k = [a_k, b_k]$ and $\{I_k\}$ is ordered from right to left, that is, $\cdots < a_k \le b_k < a_{k-1} \le b_{k-1} < \cdots < a_0 \le b_0$ (see [6, 20, 21]).

For any given $0 \le n_1 \le n_2 \le \infty$, if $n_2 \ne \infty$, let

$$\begin{aligned} V^{n_1,n_2}(\omega) = \{v \in X : \ & \|\Psi(t,\omega)v\| = o(e^{a^- t}) \text{ as } t \to -\infty \\ & \|\Psi(t,\omega)v\| = o(e^{b^+ t}) \text{ as } t \to \infty\} \end{aligned}$$

where a^-, b^+ are such that $\lambda_1 < a^- < a_{n_2} \le b_{n_1} < b^+ < \lambda_2$ for any $\lambda_1 \in \cup_{k=n_2+1}^\infty I_k$ and $\lambda_2 \in \cup_{k=0}^{n_1-1} I_k$. If $n_2 = \infty$, let

$$V^{n_1,\infty}(\omega) = \{v \in X : \|\Psi(t,\omega)v\| = o(e^{b^+ t}) \text{as } t \to \infty\}$$

where b^+ is such that $b_{n_1} < b^+ < \lambda$ for any $\lambda \in \cup_{k=0}^{n_1-1} I_k$. $V^{n_1,n_2}(\omega)$ is called the *invariant subspace* of (2.4) or (2.6) associated with the spectrum set $\cup_{k=n_1}^{n_2} I_k$ at $\omega \in \Omega$.

Suppose that $0 \in \sigma(\Omega)$ and n_0 is such that $0 \in I_{n_0} \subset \sigma(\Omega)$. Then $V^s(\omega) = V^{n_0+1,\infty}(\omega)$, $V^{cs}(\omega) = V^{n_0,\infty}(\omega)$, $V^c(\omega) = V^{n_0,n_0}(\omega)$, $V^{cu}(\omega) = V^{0,n_0}(\omega)$, and $V^u(\omega) = V^{0,n_0-1}(\omega)$ are referred to as *stable, center stable, center, center unstable*, and *unstable subspaces* of (2.4) at $\omega \in \Omega$, respectively.

Suppsoe that $0 \notin \sigma(\Omega)$ and n_0 is such that $I_{n_0} \subset (0,\infty)$ and $I_{n_0+1} \subset (-\infty, 0)$. $V^s(\omega) = V^{n_0+1,\infty}(\omega)$ and $V^u(\omega) = V^{0,n_0}(\omega)$ are referred to as *stable* and *unstable subspaces* of (2.4) at $\omega \in \Omega$, respectively.

The following lemma follows from Lemma 2.5 directly.

Lemma 2.6. *For given $0 \le n_1 \le n_2 \le \infty$, we have $N_1 \le z(v(\cdot)) \le N_2$ for any $v \in V^{n_1,n_2}(\omega)$, where*

$$N_1 = \begin{cases} \dim V^{0,n_1-1}, & \text{if } \dim V^{0,n_1-1} \text{ is even;} \\ \dim V^{0,n_1-1} + 1, & \text{if } \dim V^{0,n_1-1} \text{ is odd,} \end{cases}$$

and

$$N_2 = \begin{cases} \dim V^{0,n_2}, & \textit{if } \dim V^{0,n_2} \textit{ is even;} \\ \dim V^{0,n_2} - 1, & \textit{if } \dim V^{0,n_2} \textit{ is odd.} \end{cases}$$

2.5 Invariant manifolds of nonlinear parabolic equations on S^1

Consider

$$v' = A(\omega \cdot t)v + F(v, \omega \cdot t), \quad t > 0,\ \omega \in \Omega,\ v \in X \tag{2.8}$$

where $\omega \cdot t$ and $A(\omega \cdot t)$ are as in (2.6), $F(\cdot, \omega) \in C^1(X, X_0)$, $F(v, \cdot) \in C^0(\Omega, X_0)$ $(v \in X)$, $F^\omega(t, v) = F(v, \omega \cdot t)$ is Hölder continuous in t, and $F(v, y) = o(\|v\|)$ $(X_0 = L^2(S^1))$, here X is as in the previous subsection. It is well-known that the solution operator $\Phi_t(\cdot, \omega)$ of (2.8) exists in the usual sense, that is, for any $v \in X$, $\Phi_0(v, \omega) = v$, $\Phi_t(v, \omega) \in \mathcal{D}(A(\omega \cdot t))$; $\Phi_t(v, \omega)$ is differentiable in t with respect to X_0 norm and satisfies (2.8) for $t > 0$.

Suppose that $\sigma(\Omega) = \cup_{k=0}^{\infty} I_k$ is the spectrum of (2.6). The following lemma can be proved by using arguments as in [7, 9, 12]

Lemma 2.7. *There is a $\delta_0 > 0$ such that for any $0 < \delta^* < \delta_0$ and $0 \le n_1 \le n_2 \le \infty$, (2.8) admits for each $\omega \in \Omega$ a local invariant manifold $W^{n_1,n_2}(\omega, \delta^*)$ with the following properties.*

(i) *There are $K_0 > 0$, and bounded continuous function $h^{n_1,n_2}(\omega) : V^{n_1,n_2}(\omega) \to V^{n_2+1,\infty}(\omega) \oplus V^{0,n_1-1}(\omega))$ being C^1 for each fixed $\omega \in \Omega$, and $h^{n_1,n_2}(v, \omega) = o(\|v\|)$, $\|(\partial h^{n_1,n_2}/\partial v)(v, \omega)\| \le K_0$ for all $\omega \in \Omega$, $v \in V^{n_1,n_2}(\omega)$ such that*

$$W^{n_1,n_2}(\omega, \delta^*) = \{v_0^{n_1,n_2} + h^{n_1,n_2}(v_0^{n_1,n_2}, \omega) : v_0^{n_1,n_2} \in V^{n_1,n_2}(\omega) \cap \{v \in X : \|v\| < \delta^*\}\}.$$

Moreover, $W^{n_1,n_2}(\omega, \delta^*)$ are diffeomorphic to $V^{n_1,n_2}(\omega) \cap \{v \in X | \|v\| < \delta^*\}$, and $W^{n_1,n_2}(\omega, \delta^*)$ are tangent to $V^{n_1,n_2}(\omega)$ at $0 \in X$ for each $\omega \in \Omega$.

(ii) *$W^{n_1,n_2}(\omega, \delta^*)$ is locally invariant in the sense that for any $v \in W^{n_1,n_2}(\omega, \delta^*)$, there is a $\tau > 0$ such that $\Phi_t(v, \omega) \in W^{n_1,n_2}(\omega \cdot t, \delta^*)$ for any $t \in \mathbb{R}$ with $0 < t < \tau$.*

Remark 2.3. (1) The existence of δ_0 in the above lemma which is independent of n_1 and n_2 is due to the increasing of the gaps between the spectrum intervals I_n and I_{n+1} as increases.

(2) Note that, as usual, $W^{n_1,n_2}(\omega, \delta^*)$ is constructed in terms of appropriate rate conditions for the solutions of (2.8) by replacing F by a cutoff function $\tilde{F}$. It then follows that for any $n_1 \le n_2 \le n_3 \le \infty$ and $\omega \in \Omega$, $W^{n_1,n_2}(\omega, \delta^*) \subset W^{n_1,n_3}(\omega, \delta^*)$, and for any $u \in W^{n_1,\infty}(\omega, \delta^*)$, there are $u_n \in W^{n_1,n}(\omega, \delta^*)$ $(n_1 \le n < \infty)$ such that $u_n \to u$ as $n \to \infty$.

(3) For any $0 \le n_1 \le n_2 < \infty$ and $\omega \in \Omega$, there are $\tau > 0$ and $0 < \delta_1^* < \delta_0$, such that $\Phi_t(W^{n_1,n_2}(\omega, \delta_1^*), \omega) \subset W^{n_1,n_2}(\omega \cdot t, \delta^*)$ for any t with $|t| < \tau$.

If $0 \in I_{n_0} = [a_{n_0}, b_{n_0}] \subset \sigma(\Omega)$. Then $W^s(\omega, \delta^*) = W^{n_0+1,\infty}(\omega, \delta^*)$, $W^{cs}(\omega, \delta^*) = W^{n_0,\infty}(\omega, \delta^*)$, $W^c(\omega, \delta^*) = W^{n_0,n_0}(\omega, \delta^*)$, $W^{cu}(\omega, \delta^*) = W^{0,n_0}(\omega, \delta^*)$, and $W^u(\omega, \delta^*) = W^{0,n_0-1}(\omega, \delta^*)$ are referred to as *local stable, center stable, center, center unstable, and unstable manifolds* of (2.8) at $\omega \in \Omega$, respectively.

Remark 2.4. (1) $W^s(\omega,\delta^*)$ and $W^u(\omega,\delta^*)$ are overflowing invariant in the sense that if δ^* is sufficiently small, then

$$\Phi_t(W^s(\omega,\delta^*),\omega)\subset W^s(\omega\cdot t,\delta^*),$$

for t sufficiently positive, and

$$\Phi_t(W^u(\omega,\delta^*),\omega)\subset W^u(\omega\cdot t,\delta^*),$$

for t sufficiently negative. Moreover, one can find constants α, $C>0$, such that for any $\omega\in\Omega$, $v^s\in W^s(\omega,\delta^*)$, $v^u\in W^u(\omega,\delta^*)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Phi_t(v^s,\omega)\| &\le Ce^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}t}\|v^s\| \quad \text{for } t\ge 0,\\ \|\Phi_t(v^u,\omega)\| &\le Ce^{\frac{\alpha}{2}t}\|v^u\| \quad \text{for } t\le 0. \end{aligned} \tag{2.9}$$

(2) By the invariant foliation theory [7,9], one has that for any $\omega\in\Omega$,

$$W^{cs}(\omega,\delta^*)=\cup_{u_c\in W^c(\omega,\delta^*)}\bar{W}_s(u_c,\omega,\delta^*),$$

where $\bar{W}_s(u_c,\omega,\delta^*)$ is the so-called *stable leaf* of (2.8) at u_c, and it is invariant in the sense that if $\tau>0$ is such that $\Phi_t(u_c,\omega)\in W^c(\omega\cdot t,\delta^*)$ and $\Phi_t(u,\omega)\in W^{cs}(\omega,\delta^*)$ for all $0\le t<\tau$, where $u\in\bar{W}_s(u_c,\omega,\delta^*)$, then $\Phi_t(u,\omega)\subset\bar{W}_s(\Phi_t(u_c,\omega),\omega\cdot t,\delta^*)$ for $0\le t<\tau$. Moreover, there are $K,\beta>0$ such that for any $u\in\bar{W}_s(u_c,\omega,\delta^*)$ ($u_c\neq 0$) and $\tau>0$ with $\Phi_t(u,\omega)\in W^{cs}(\omega\cdot t,\delta^*)$, $\Phi_t(u_c,\omega)\in W^c(\omega\cdot t,\delta^*)$ for $0\le t<\tau$, one has that

$$\frac{\|\Phi_t(u,\omega)-\Phi_t(u_c,\omega)\|}{\|\Phi_t(u_c,\omega)\|}\le Ke^{-\beta t}\frac{\|u-u_c\|}{\|u_c\|}$$

and

$$\|\Phi_t(u,\omega)-\Phi_t(u_c,\omega)\|\le Ke^{-\beta t}\|u-u_c\|$$

for $0\le t<\tau$.

3 Almost Automorphically and Almost Periodically Forced Circle Flows

In this section, we consider the structure of minimal sets of (1.2) in the case that $f=f(t,u,u_x)$.

Note that (1.2) generates a (local) skew-product semiflow Π^t on $X\times H(f)$:

$$\Pi^t(u_0,g)=(\varphi(t,\cdot;u_0,g),g\cdot t), \tag{3.1}$$

where X is also defined as in introduction and $\varphi(t,\cdot;u_0,g)$ is the solution of (1.2) with $\varphi(0,\cdot,u_0,g)=u_0(\cdot)$, and $g\cdot t$ denotes the flow on $H(f)$.

Let $\Omega\subset X\times H(f)$ be a compact and connected invariant set of (3.1). For any $\omega=(u_0,g)\in\Omega$, denote $\omega\cdot t=\Pi^t(u_0,g)$. Let $v=\varphi(t,\cdot;u,g)-\varphi(t,\cdot;u_0,g)$. Then v satisfies the following equation:

$$v_t=v_{xx}+a(x,\omega\cdot t)v_x+b(x,\omega\cdot t)v+F(v,\omega\cdot t),\ \ t>0,\ x\in S^1=\mathbb{R}/2\pi\mathbb{Z}, \tag{3.2}$$

where $F(v,\omega\cdot t)=g(t,v+u_0,v_x+u_{0x})-g(t,u_0,u_{0x})-a(x,\omega\cdot t)-b(x,\omega\cdot t)v$, $a(x,\omega\cdot t)=g_p(t,u_0,u_{0x})$, $b(x,\omega\cdot t)=g_u(t,u_0,u_{0x})$.

Denote $A(\omega)=\frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2}+a(\cdot,\omega)\frac{\partial}{\partial x}+b(\cdot,\omega)$. Then (1.2) can be rewritten as

$$v'=A(\omega\cdot t)v+F(v,\omega\cdot t). \tag{3.3}$$

Suppose that $\sigma(\Omega)=\cup_{k=0}^{\infty}I_k$ (I_k is ordered from right to left) is the Sacker-Sell spectrum of the linear equation associated with (3.3):

$$v'=A(\omega\cdot t)v,\ t>0,\ \omega\in\Omega,\ v\in X. \tag{3.4}$$

For any given $0\le n_1\le n_2\le\infty$, let $V^{n_1,n_2}(\omega)$ be the invariant subspace of (3.4) associated with the spectrum set $\cup_{k=n_1}^{n_2}I_k$ at $\omega\in\Omega$. If $0\in\sigma(\Omega)$, let $V^s(\omega)$, $V^{cs}(\omega)$, $V^c(\omega)$, $V^{cu}(\omega)$, and $V^u(\omega)$ be the *stable, center stable, center, center unstable*, and *unstable subspaces* of (3.4) at $\omega\in\Omega$, respectively.

For given $u\in X$, we define

$$\Sigma u=\{u(\cdot+a)\,|\,a\in S^1\}.$$

The main results of this section are stated in the following theorems.

Theorem 3.1. *Let $M\subset X\times H(f)$ be a spatially inhomogeneous minimal set of (3.1).*

(1) *If $\dim V^c(\omega)=2$ with $\dim V^u(\omega)$ being odd, then there is a residual invariant set $Y_0\subset H(f)$ and an $L\in(0,2\pi]$, such that for any $g\in Y_0$, there exists $u_g\in X$ (whose minimal period is L) satisfying $p^{-1}(g)\cap M\subset(\Sigma u_g,g)$. Moreover, there are two functions $c^g:\mathbb{R}\to\mathcal{S}^1;t\mapsto c^g(t)$ and $G:\mathbb{R}\times\mathcal{S}^1\to\mathcal{S}^1;(t,\cdot)\mapsto G(t,\cdot)$ such that*

$$\varphi(t,x,u_g,g)=u_g(x+c^g(t)),$$
$$\dot{c}^g(t)=G(t,c^g(t)),$$

where $\mathcal{S}^1=\mathbb{R}/L\mathbb{Z}$ and $G(t,\cdot)$ is almost automorphic in t.

(2) *If $\dim V^c(\omega)=1$, $Y_0=H(f)$ in (1) and $G(t,\cdot)$ is almost periodic in t.*

Theorem 3.2. *Let $M\subset X\times H(f)$ be a minimal set of (3.1).*

(1) *If M is unique ergodic, then $\dim V^c(\omega)\le 2$. Moreover, if $\dim V^c(\omega)=2$, then $\dim V^u(\omega)$ must be odd.*

(2) *If M is spatially homogeneous, then either $\dim V^u(\omega)=0$ or $\dim V^u(\omega)$ is odd.*

Remark 3.1. Theorem 3.1 implies that, under certain circumstances, any spatially inhomogeneous minimal set M can be residually embedded into an almost automorphic forced circle-flow $S^1\times H(f)$. In particular, if M is *normally hyperbolic* (i.e., $\dim V^c(\omega)=1$), M can be totally embedded into an almost periodically forced circle-flow. Thus we have generalized the results of Fiedler and Sandstede [22] to time almost-periodic systems. However, for almost periodically forced circle flow, it is already known that such flow can still be very complicated (See [13] and the references therein).

To prove the above theorem, we need to present some lemmas.

For given $0 \le n_1 \le n_2 \le \infty$ and $\omega = (u_0, g) \in \Omega$, by Lemma 2.7, there is a well-defined local invariant manifold $W^{n_1,n_2}(\omega, \delta^*)$ of (3.3). Let

$$M^{n_1,n_2}(\omega, \delta^*) = \{u \in X | u - u_0 \in W^{n_1,n_2}(\omega, \delta^*)\}. \tag{3.5}$$

$M^{n_1,n_2}(\omega, \delta^*)$ is referred to as a *local invariant manifold* of (3.1) at (u_0, g).

Suppose that $0 \in \sigma(\Omega)$ and n_0 is such that $I_{n_0} = [a_{n_0}, b_{n_0}] \subset \sigma(\Omega)$ with $a_{n_0} \le 0 \le b_{n_0}$. For given $\omega = (u_0, g) \in \Omega$, $\delta^* > 0$, let

$$\begin{aligned} M^s(\omega, \delta^*) =& M^{n_0+1,\infty}(\omega, \delta^*) \\ M^{cs}(\omega, \delta^*) =& M^{n_0,\infty}(\omega, \delta^*) \\ M^c(\omega, \delta^*) =& M^{n_0,n_0}(\omega, \delta^*) \\ M^{cu}(\omega, \delta^*) =& M^{0,n_0}(\omega, \delta^*) \\ M^u(\omega, \delta^*) =& M^{0,n_0-1}(\omega, \delta^*) \end{aligned}$$

Then $M^s(\omega, \delta^*)$, $M^{cs}(\omega, \delta^*)$, $M^c(\omega, \delta^*)$, $M^{cu}(\omega, \delta^*)$, and $M^u(\omega, \delta^*)$ are continuous in $\omega \in \Omega$ and referred to as *local stable, center stable, center, center unstable*, and *unstable manifolds* of (3.1) at $\omega = (u_0, g) \in \Omega$, respectively.

Remark 3.2. By Remark 2.4(2), for any $\omega = (u_0, g) \in \Omega$, one has

$$M^{cs}(\omega, \delta^*) = \cup_{u_c \in M^c(\omega,\delta^*)} \bar{M}_s(u_c, \omega, \delta^*)$$

where $\bar{M}_s(u_c, \omega, \delta^*) = \{u \in X | u - u_0 \in \bar{W}^s(u_c - u_0, \omega, \delta^*)\}$ and $\bar{M}_s(u_0, \omega, \delta^*) = M^s(\omega, \delta^*)$. Moreover, there are K, $\beta > 0$ such that for any $u^* \in \bar{M}_s(u_c, \omega, \delta^*)$, $u_c \ne u_0$, and $\tau > 0$ with $\varphi(t, \cdot; u^*, g) \in M^{cs}(\omega \cdot t, \delta^*)$, $\varphi(t, \cdot; u_c, g) \in M^c(\omega \cdot t, \delta^*)$ for any $0 \le t < \tau$, one has that

$$\frac{\|\varphi(t, \cdot; u^*, g) - \varphi(t, \cdot; u_c, g)\|}{\|\varphi(t, \cdot; u_c, g) - \varphi(t, \cdot; u_0, g)\|} \le K e^{-\beta t} \frac{\|u^* - u_c\|}{\|u_c - u_0\|} \tag{3.6}$$

and

$$||\varphi(t, \cdot; u^*, g) - \varphi(t, \cdot; u_c, g)|| \le K e^{-\beta t} \|u^* - u_c\| \tag{3.7}$$

for $0 \le t < \tau$.

Lemma 3.3. *Let $\delta^* > 0$ as in Lemma 2.7. Then for any $\delta \in (0, \delta^*)$, there exists some $\delta_{cs} \in (0, \delta)$ such that, for any $\omega = (u_0, g) \in \Omega$, $u_c \in M^c(\omega, \delta_{cs}) \setminus \{u_0\}$ and $u^* \in \bar{M}_s(u_c, \omega, \delta_{cs}) \setminus \{u_0\}$, the following statements hold:*

(i) *Let $\tau > 0$ be any number such that $\varphi(t, \cdot; u_c, g) \in M^c(\omega \cdot t, \delta) \setminus \{\varphi(t, \cdot; u_0, g)\}$ for $0 \le t < \tau$. Then $\varphi(t, \cdot; u^*, g) \in M^{cs}(\omega \cdot t, \delta^*)$ for $0 \le t < \tau$.*

(ii) *Let* $\tau > 0$ *be any number such that* $\varphi(t, \cdot; u_c, g) \in M^c(\omega \cdot t, \delta) \setminus \{\varphi(t, \cdot; u_0, g)\}$ *for* $0 \le t < \tau$, *but* $\varphi(\tau, \cdot; u_c, g) \notin M^c(\omega \cdot \tau, \delta) \setminus \{\varphi(\tau, \cdot; u_0, g)\}$. *Then for any* $\epsilon > 0$, *one may take such* $\delta_{cs} > 0$ *smaller so that*

$$\frac{\|\varphi(\tau, \cdot; u^*, g) - \varphi(\tau, \cdot; u_c, g)\|}{\|\varphi(\tau, \cdot; u_c, g) - \varphi(\tau, \cdot; u_0, g)\|} \le \epsilon. \tag{3.8}$$

(iii) *If* $\varphi(t, \cdot; u_c, g) \in M^c(\omega \cdot t, \delta) \setminus \{\varphi(t, \cdot; u_0, g)\}$ *for any* $t > 0$, *then*

$$\frac{\|\varphi(t, \cdot; u^*, g) - \varphi(t, \cdot; u_c, g)\|}{\|\varphi(t, \cdot; u_c, g) - \varphi(t, \cdot; u_0, g)\|} \le \epsilon. \tag{3.9}$$

for all $t > 0$ *sufficiently large.*

Proof. The statement in this lemma can also be found in [27, p.313]. For the sake of completeness, we give a detailed proof below.

(i) Suppose on the contrary that there exist sequences $\delta_n \to 0$, $\omega_n \triangleq (u_n, g_n) \in \Omega$, $u_c^n \in M^c(\omega_n, \delta_n)$, $u_n^* \in \bar{M}_s(u_c^n, \omega_n, \delta_n) \setminus \{u_c^n\}$ and $\tau_n > 0$ satisfying that

$$\varphi(t, \cdot; u_c^n, g_n) \in M^c(\omega_n \cdot t, \delta) \ \text{ for } 0 \le t < \tau_n, \tag{3.10}$$

while one can find some $t_n \in [0, \tau_n)$ such that

$$\varphi(t, \cdot; u_n^*, g_n) \in M^{cs}(\omega_n \cdot t, \delta^*) \text{ for } t \in [0, t_n), \text{ but } \varphi(t_n, \cdot; u_n^*, g_n) \notin M^{cs}(\omega_n \cdot t_n, \delta^*). \tag{3.11}$$

Recall that $\delta_n \to 0$. Then $||u_c^n - u_n|| \to 0$ and $||u_n^* - u_c^n|| \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$. If $\{t_n\}$ is bounded, then $\|\varphi(t, \cdot; u_n^*, g_n) - \varphi(t, \cdot; u_n, g_n)\| \to 0$ uniformly for $t \in [0, t_n]$. This entails that $\|\varphi(t_n, \cdot; u_n^*, g_n) - \varphi(t_n, \cdot; u_n, g_n)\| < \delta^*$ for all n sufficiently large. So, the local invariance of $M^{cs}(\omega, \delta^*)$ implies that $\varphi(t_n, \cdot; u_n^*, g_n) \in M^{cs}(\omega_n \cdot t_n, \delta^*)$, a contradiction to the second statement of (3.11).

If $\{t_n\}$ is unbounded, then it follows from (3.10) and the first statement of (3.11) that $\varphi(t, \cdot; u_n^*, g_n) \in \bar{M}_s(\varphi(t, \cdot; u_c^n, g_n), \omega_n \cdot t, \delta^*)$, for $t \in [0, t_n)$. So, by (3.7), there exist $K > 0, \beta > 0$ such that $\|\varphi(t, \cdot; u_n^*, g_n) - \varphi(t, \cdot; u_c^n, g_n)\| \le Ke^{-\beta t}\|u_n^* - u_c^n\|$ for $0 \le t < t_n$. Consequently, $\|\varphi(t_n, \cdot; u_n^*, g_n) - \varphi(t_n, \cdot; u_c^n, g_n)\| < \frac{\delta^* - \delta}{2}$, for n sufficiently large. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|\varphi(t_n, \cdot; u_n^*, g_n) - \varphi(t_n, \cdot; u_n, g_n)\| \\
&\le \|\varphi(t_n, \cdot; u_n^*, g_n) - \varphi(t_n, \cdot; u_c^n, g_n)\| + \|\varphi(t_n, \cdot; u_c^n, g_n) - \varphi(t_n, \cdot; u_n, g_n)\| \\
&< \frac{\delta^* - \delta}{2} + \delta < \delta^*, \quad \text{for } n \text{ sufficiently large.}
\end{aligned}$$

(Here, $\|\varphi(t_n, \cdot; u_c^n, g_n) - \varphi(t_n, \cdot; u_n, g_n)\| \le \delta$ is due to (3.10).) By the local invariance of $M^{cs}(\omega, \delta^*)$ again, we obtain $\varphi(t_n, \cdot; u_n^*, g_n) \in M^{cs}(\omega_n \cdot t_n, \delta^*)$ for n sufficiently large, a contradiction to the second statement of (3.11). Thus, we have proved (i).

(ii) By virtue of (i), one has $\varphi(t, \cdot; u^*, g) \in M^{cs}(\omega \cdot t, \delta^*)$ for $0 \le t < \tau$. It then follows from Remark 3.2 that (3.7) holds for $0 \le t < \tau$. As a consequence, we have

$$\frac{\|\varphi(\tau, \cdot; u^*, g) - \varphi(\tau, \cdot; u_c, g)\|}{\|\varphi(\tau, \cdot; u_c, g) - \varphi(\tau, \cdot; u_0, g)\|} \le \frac{Ke^{-\beta\tau}\delta_{cs}}{\delta} \le \frac{K\delta_{cs}}{\delta}.$$

So, for any $\epsilon > 0$, one can choose δ_{cs} smaller so that (3.8) holds.

(iii) Again, by (i), one has $\varphi(t, \cdot; u^*, g) \in M^{cs}(\omega \cdot t, \delta^*)$ for all $t > 0$. So, (3.6) in Remark 3.2 implies that (3.9) holds for any t sufficiently large. Thus, we have completed the proof of this lemma. □

Lemma 3.4. *Let δ_0 be as in Lemma 2.7 and sufficiently small. For any given $0 \le n_1 \le n_2 \le \infty$, let N_1 and N_2 be as in Lemma 2.6. Then the following holds.*

(i) *If $n_2 < \infty$, then there is a $0 < \delta^*_{n_1,n_2} < \delta_0$ such that $N_1 \le z(u(\cdot) - u_0(\cdot)) \le N_2$ for any $u \in M^{n_1,n_2}(\omega, \delta^*_{n_1,n_2}) \setminus \{u_0\}$ ($\omega = (u_0, g) \in \Omega$).*

(ii) *If $n_1 \ge 0$ is such that $I_{n_1} \subset \mathbb{R}^- = \{\lambda \in \mathbb{R} | \lambda < 0\}$, then for any $\delta^* \in (0, \delta_0)$, $n_1 \le n_2 \le \infty$, and $u \in M^{n_1,n_2}(\omega, \delta^*) \setminus \{u_0\}$ ($\omega = (u_0, g) \in \Omega$), one has $z(u(\cdot) - u_0(\cdot)) \ge N_1$.*

(iii) *Let $n_1 \ge 0$ be such that $0 \in I_{n_1}$. If $\dim V^{n_1,n_1}(\omega) = 1$, or $\dim V^{n_1,n_1}(\omega) = 2$ with $\dim V^u(\omega)$ being odd, then there is a $\delta^*_{n_1,\infty} \in (0, \delta_0)$ such that $z(u(\cdot) - u_0(\cdot)) \ge N_1$, for any $u \in M^{n_1,\infty}(\omega, \delta^*_{n_1,\infty}) \setminus \{u_0\}$ ($\omega = (u_0, g) \in \Omega$).*

Proof. (i) Suppose that there are some $0 \le n_1 \le n_2 < \infty$, some sequences $\delta_n \to 0$, $\omega_n = (u_n, y_n)$ and $\tilde{u}_n \in W^{n_1,n_2}(\omega_n, \delta_n) \setminus \{u_n\}$ such that $z(\tilde{u}_n(\cdot) - u_n(\cdot)) < N_1$ or $z(\tilde{u}_n(\cdot) - u_n(\cdot)) > N_2$. Let $v_n(\cdot) = \frac{\tilde{u}_n(\cdot) - u_n(\cdot)}{\|\tilde{u}_n(\cdot) - u_n(\cdot)\|}$. Since $\tilde{u}_n - u_n \in W^{n_1,n_2}(\omega_n, \delta_n)$ and $n_2 < \infty$, it follows from Lemma 2.7 that $\tilde{u}_n - u_n = v_n^{n_1,n_2} + h^{n_1,n_2}(v_n^{n_1,n_2}, \omega_n)$, where $v_n^{n_1,n_2} \in V^{n_1,n_2}(\omega_n) \setminus \{0\}$ with $\|v_n^{n_1,n_2}\| < \delta_n$ and $\|h^{n_1,n_2}(v, \omega_n)\| = o(\|v\|)$. So, one has

$$v_n(\cdot) = \frac{v_n^{n_1,n_2} + h^{n_1,n_2}(v_n^{n_1,n_2}, \omega_n)}{\|v_n^{n_1,n_2} + h^{n_1,n_2}(v_n^{n_1,n_2}, \omega_n)\|} \tag{3.12}$$

Note that $n_2 < \infty$ and Ω is compact. We may assume without loss of generality that $\frac{v_n^{n_1,n_2}}{\|v_n^{n_1,n_2}\|} \to v^*$ and $\omega_n = (u_n, g_n) \to \omega^* = (u^*, g^*)$ as $n \to \infty$. Then by (3.12), $v_n \to v^* \in V^{n_1,n_2}(\omega^*)$. Moreover, for $|t| \ll 1$, by Remark 2.3(3),

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\varphi(t, \cdot; \tilde{u}_n, g_n) - \varphi(t, \cdot; u_n, g_n)}{\|\tilde{u}_n - u_n\|} &= \frac{\frac{v(t, v_n^{n_1,n_2}) + h^{n_1,n_2}(v(t, v_n^{n_1,n_2}), \omega_n \cdot t)}{\|v(t, v_n^{n_1,n_2})\|}}{\frac{\|v_n^{n_1,n_2} + h^{n_1,n_2}(v_n^{n_1,n_2}, \omega_n)\|}{\|v_n^{n_1,n_2}\|}} \cdot \frac{\|v(t, v_n^{n_1,n_2})\|}{\|v_n^{n_1,n_2}\|} \\ &\to \frac{v(t, v^*)}{\|v(t, v^*)\|} \cdot \|v(t, v^*)\| = v(t, v^*), \end{aligned}$$

as $n \to \infty$, where $v(t, v^*)$ is the solution of (3.4), with ω replaced by ω^*, such that $v(0, v^*) = v^*$. By Lemma 2.6, $N_1 \le z(v(t, v^*)) \le N_2$ for $|t|$ sufficiently small. Let $t_2 < 0 < t_1$ and $|t_1|$, $|t_2|$ so small that $v(t_1, v^*)$, $v(t_2, v^*)$ have only simple zeros. Then $z(\varphi(t_1, \cdot; \tilde{u}_n, g_n) - \varphi(t_1, \cdot; u_n, g_n)) = z(v(t_1, v^*)) \ge N_1$ and $z(\varphi(t_2, \cdot; \tilde{u}_n, g_n) - \varphi(t_2, \cdot; u_n, g_n)) \le N_2$ for n sufficiently large. Thus, by Lemma 2.3(a), we obtain $N_1 \le z(\tilde{u}_n(\cdot) - u_n(\cdot)) \le N_2$, a contradiction to the definition of $\tilde{u}_n(\cdot)$ and $u_n(\cdot)$.

(ii) We first prove that (ii) is true for any $n_2 < \infty$. In fact, when δ_0 is sufficiently small, Remark 2.4(1) implies that, for any $n_1 \le n_2 < \infty$, $0 < \delta^* < \delta_0$ and $u^* \in M^{n_1,n_2}(\omega, \delta^*) \setminus \{u_0\}$, one has $\varphi(t, \cdot; u^*, g) \in M^{n_1,n_2}(\omega \cdot t, \delta^*_{n_1,n_2}) \setminus \{\varphi(t, \cdot; u_0, g)\}$ for t sufficiently positive, where $\delta^*_{n_1,n_2}$ is defined in (i). Then, by (i), we obtain that $z(\varphi(t, \cdot; u^*, g) - \varphi(t, \cdot; u_0, g)) \ge N_1$ for t sufficiently positive. It then follows from Lemma 2.3 (a) that $z(u^*(\cdot) - u_0(\cdot)) \ge N_1$.

We next consider the case $n_2 = \infty$. Let $u^* \in M^{n_1,\infty}(\omega, \delta^*) \setminus \{u_0\}$. By Remark 2.3 (2), there are $u_n \in M^{n_1,n}(\omega, \delta^*) \setminus \{u_0\}$ $(n_1 \le n < \infty)$ such that $u_n \to u^*$ as $n \to \infty$. Choose a $t_0 > 0$ so small that $\varphi(t_0, \cdot; u^*, y) - \varphi(t_0, \cdot; u_0, g)$ has only simple zeros. Then $z(\varphi(t_0, \cdot; u^*, g) - \varphi(t_0, \cdot; u_0, g)) = z(\varphi(t_0, \cdot; u_n^*, g) - \varphi(t_0, \cdot; u_0, g)) \ge N_1$ for n sufficiently large. This implies that $z(u^*(\cdot) - u_0(\cdot)) \ge N_1$.

(iii) If $\dim V^{n_1,n_1}(\omega) = 1$, or $\dim V^{n_1,n_1}(\omega) = 2$ with $\dim V^u(\omega)$ being odd, then Lemma 2.6 implies that $z(w(\cdot)) = N_1$ for any $w \in V^{n_1,n_1}(\omega) \setminus \{0\}$.

Since $\dim V^{n_1,n_1}(\omega) < \infty$ and Ω is compact, one can find $\delta_c > 0$ such that

$$z(w(\cdot, \omega)) = z(\frac{w(\cdot, \omega)}{\|w(\cdot, \omega)\|} + v(\cdot)) = N_1 \tag{3.13}$$

for any $w(\cdot, \omega) \in V^{n_1,n_1}(\omega) \setminus \{0\}$, $v \in X$ with $||v|| < \delta_c$ and $\omega \in \Omega$.

Choose any $\delta^* > 0$ be defined in Lemma 2.7, so that

$$u - u_0 = v_0^{n_1,n_1} + h^{n_1,n_1}(v_0^{n_1,n_1}, \omega) \tag{3.14}$$

for any $u \in M^{n_1,n_1}(\omega, \delta^*) \setminus \{u_0\}$, where $v_0^{n_1,n_1} \in V^{n_1,n_1}(\omega) \setminus \{0\}$ and

$$\frac{\|h^{n_1,n_1}(v_0^{n_1,n_1}, \omega)\|}{\|v_0^{n_1,n_1}\|} < \frac{\delta_c}{2}, \quad \text{for all } ||v_0^{n_1,n_1}|| \le \delta^*. \tag{3.15}$$

Now note that $M^{n_1,\infty}(\omega, \delta^*) = M^{cs}(\omega, \delta^*)$ and $M^{n_1,n_1}(\omega, \delta^*) = M^c(\omega, \delta^*)$. By Remark 3.2, one has $M^{n_1,\infty}(\omega, \delta^*) = \cup_{u_c \in M^c(\omega,\delta^*)} \bar{M}_s(u_c, \omega, \delta^*)$. Moreover, fix any $\delta \in (0, \delta^*_{n_1,n_1}) \subset (0, \delta^*)$, it follows from Lemma 3.3 that there is some $\delta_{cs} \in (0, \delta)$ such that for any $\omega \in \Omega, u_c \in M^c(\omega, \delta_{cs}) \setminus \{u_0\}$ and $u^* \in \bar{M}_s(u_c, \omega, \delta_{cs}) \setminus \{u_0\}$, the following statement (a)-(c) hold:

(a) If $\tau > 0$ is such that $\varphi(t, \cdot; u_c, g) \in M^c(\omega \cdot t, \delta) \setminus \{\varphi(t, \cdot; u_0, g)\}$ for $0 \le t < \tau$, then $\varphi(t, \cdot; u^*, g) \in M^{n_1,\infty}(\omega \cdot t, \delta^*)$ for $0 \le t < \tau$.

(b) If $\tau > 0$ is such that $\varphi(t, \cdot; u_c, g) \in M^c(\omega \cdot t, \delta) \setminus \{\varphi(t, \cdot; u_0, g)\}$ for $0 \le t < \tau$ and $\varphi(\tau, \cdot; u_c, g) \notin M^c(\omega \cdot \tau, \delta) \setminus \{\varphi(\tau, \cdot; u_0, g)\}$ then

$$\frac{\|\varphi(\tau, \cdot; u^*, g) - \varphi(\tau, \cdot; u_c, g)\|}{\|\varphi(\tau, \cdot; u_c, g) - \varphi(\tau, \cdot; u_0, g)\|} \le \frac{\delta_c}{2} \tag{3.16}$$

(c) If for any $t > 0$, $\varphi(t, \cdot; u_c, g) \in M^c(\omega \cdot t, \delta) \setminus \{\varphi(t, \cdot; u_0, g)\}$, then

$$\frac{\|\varphi(t, \cdot; u^*, g) - \varphi(t, \cdot; u_c, g)\|}{\|\varphi(t, \cdot; u_c, g) - \varphi(t, \cdot; u_0, g)\|} \le \frac{\delta_c}{2} \tag{3.17}$$

for $t > 0$ sufficiently large. Hereafter, we write δ_{cs} as $\delta^*_{n_1,\infty}$.

Now let $u^* \in M^{n_1,\infty}(\omega, \delta^*_{n_1,\infty}) \setminus \{u_0\}$. If $u^* \in M^{n_1+1,\infty}(\omega, \delta^*_{n_1,\infty}) \setminus \{u_0\}$, then by (ii) of this lemma, we have $z(u^*(\cdot) - u_0(\cdot)) \geq N_1 + 2 > N_1$. If $u^* \in M^{n_1,\infty}(\omega, \delta^*_{n_1,\infty}) \setminus M^{n_1+1,\infty}(\omega, \delta^*_{n_1,\infty})$, then by Remark 3.2, there is a $u_c \in M^{n_1,n_1}(\omega, \delta^*_{n_1,\infty}) \setminus \{u_0\}$ such that $u^* \in \bar{M}_s(u_c, \omega, \delta^*_{n_1,\infty}) \setminus \{u_0\}$. Therefore, for any $t \geq 0$, whenever $\varphi(t, \cdot; u_c, g) \in M^{n_1,n_1}(\omega \cdot t, \delta) \setminus \{\varphi(t, \cdot; u_0, g)\}$, it follows from (3.14) that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\varphi(t, \cdot; u^*, g) - \varphi(t, \cdot; u_0, g)\\
&= \varphi(t, \cdot; u_c, g) - \varphi(t, \cdot; u_0, g) + \varphi(t, \cdot; u^*, g) - \varphi(t, \cdot; u_c, g)\\
&= \psi(t, \cdot; w, \omega) + h^{n_1,n_1}(\psi(t, \cdot; w, \omega), \omega \cdot t) + \varphi(t, \cdot; u^*, g) - \varphi(t, \cdot; u_c, g)\\
&= \|\psi(t, \cdot; w, \omega)\| \cdot \left\{ \frac{\psi(t, \cdot; w, \omega)}{\|\psi(t, \cdot; w, \omega)\|} + \frac{h^{n_1,n_1}((\psi(t, \cdot; w, \omega), \omega \cdot t)}{\|\psi(t, \cdot; w, \omega)\|} + \frac{\varphi(t, \cdot; u^*, g) - \varphi(t, \cdot; u_c, g)}{\|\psi(t, \cdot; w, \omega)\|} \right\}
\end{aligned}$$

where $\psi(t, \cdot; w, \omega) = c(t) w_k(\cdot, \omega \cdot t) + \tilde{c}(t) \tilde{w}_k(\cdot, \omega \cdot t)$, for some k, with $c(t)$, $\tilde{c}(t)$ being scalar continuous functions. By (3.15) and (3.16)-(3.17),

$$\frac{\|h^{n_1,n_1}(\psi(\tau, \cdot; w, \omega), \omega \cdot \tau)\|}{\|\psi(\tau, \cdot; w, \omega)\|} + \frac{\|\varphi(\tau, \cdot; u^*, g) - \varphi(\tau, \cdot; u_c, g)\|}{\|\psi(t, \cdot; w, \omega)\|} \leq \delta_c$$

for some $\tau > 0$. Hence, (3.13) directly yields that

$$z(\varphi(\tau, \cdot; u^*, g) - \varphi(\tau, \cdot; u_0, g)) = N_1$$

which implies that $z(u^*(\cdot) - u_0(\cdot)) \geq N_1$. Thus, we have proved (iii). □

Corollary 3.5. *Let* $\omega = (u_0, g) \in \Omega$ *and*

$$N_u = \begin{cases} \dim V^u(\omega), & \textit{if } \dim V^u(\omega) \textit{ is even,} \\ \dim V^u(\omega) + 1, & \textit{if } \dim V^u(\omega) \textit{ is odd.} \end{cases}$$

Suppose that $\dim V^u(\omega) \geq 1$ *and* $0 \leq \dim V^c(\omega) \leq 2$. *Then for* $\delta^* > 0$ *small enough, one has*

(1) *If* $\dim V^c(\omega) = 0$ *and* $\dim V^u(\omega)$ *is odd, then*

$$\begin{aligned}
&z(u(\cdot) - u_0(\cdot)) \geq N_u \quad \textit{for } u \in M^s(\omega, \delta^*) \setminus \{u_0\},\\
&z(u(\cdot) - u_0(\cdot)) \leq N_u - 2 \quad \textit{for } u \in M^u(\omega, \delta^*) \setminus \{u_0\}.
\end{aligned}$$

(2) *If* $\dim V^c(\omega) = 0$ *and* $\dim V^u(\omega)$ *is even, then*

$$\begin{aligned}
&z(u(\cdot) - u_0(\cdot)) \geq N_u \quad \textit{for } u \in M^s(\omega, \delta^*) \setminus \{u_0\},\\
&z(u(\cdot) - u_0(\cdot)) \leq N_u \quad \textit{for } u \in M^u(\omega, \delta^*) \setminus \{u_0\}.
\end{aligned}$$

(3) *If* $\dim V^c(\omega) = 1$, *then*

$$\begin{aligned}
&z(u(\cdot) - u_0(\cdot)) \geq N_u \quad \textit{for } u \in M^{cs}(\omega, \delta^*) \setminus \{u_0\},\\
&z(u(\cdot) - u_0(\cdot)) = N_u \quad \textit{for } u \in M^c(\omega, \delta^*) \setminus \{u_0\},\\
&z(u(\cdot) - u_0(\cdot)) \leq N_u \quad \textit{for } u \in M^{cu}(\omega, \delta^*) \setminus \{u_0\}.
\end{aligned}$$

(4) *If* $\dim V^c(\omega) = 2$ *and* $\dim V^u(\omega)$ *is odd, then*

$$\begin{aligned} z(u(\cdot) - u_0(\cdot)) &\geq N_u \quad \text{for } u \in M^{cs}(\omega, \delta^*) \setminus \{u_0\}, \\ z(u(\cdot) - u_0(\cdot)) &= N_u \quad \text{for } u \in M^{c}(\omega, \delta^*) \setminus \{u_0\}, \\ z(u(\cdot) - u_0(\cdot)) &\leq N_u \quad \text{for } u \in M^{cu}(\omega, \delta^*) \setminus \{u_0\}. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. It directly follows from Lemma 3.4. □

Lemma 3.6. *Suppose that* $0 \in \sigma(\Omega)$. *Then for any* $(u_1, g), (u_2, g) \in \Omega$ *with* $||u_1 - u_2|| \ll 1$, *one has* $V^s(u_1, g) \oplus V^{cu}(u_2, g) = X$, *and* $V^{cs}(u_1, g) \oplus V^u(u_2, g) = X$. *Consequently,* $(u_1 + V^s(u_1, g)) \cap (u_2 + V^{cu}(u_2, g)) \neq \emptyset$, *and* $(u_1 + V^{cs}(u_1, g)) \cap (u_2 + V^u(u_2, g)) \neq \emptyset$.

Proof. We only prove that $V^s(u_1, g) \oplus V^{cu}(u_2, g) = X$ and $(u_1 + V^s(u_1, g)) \cap (u_2 + V^{cu}(u_2, g)) \neq \emptyset$. Let $\tilde{P}(\omega)$ be projections of (3.4) satisfying: $V^s(\omega) = (I - \tilde{P}(\omega))X$ and $V^{cu}(\omega) = \tilde{P}(\omega)X$. Then $\tilde{P} : \Omega \to L(X, X)$ is continuous. We claim that for any distinct points $(u_1, g), (u_2, g) \in \Omega$ with $\|u_1 - u_2\|$ sufficiently small, one has $V^s(u_1, g) \cap V^{cu}(u_2, g) = \{0\}$.

To prove the claim, we assume that for any $n \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$, there exist $(u_{1n}, g_n), (u_{2n}, g_n) \in \Omega$ satisfied $\|u_{1n} - u_{2n}\| \leq \frac{1}{n}$ and $v_n \in V^s(u_{1n}, g) \cap V^{cu}(u_{2n}, g)$ with $\|v_n\| = 1$. Since Ω is compact, one can assume that $(u_{1n}, g_n) \to (u^*, g^*)$ and $(u_{2n}, g_n) \to (u^*, g^*)$ as $n \to \infty$. The fact that $\dim V^{cu}(\omega)$ is finite, entails that $v_n \to v^* \in V^{cu}(u^*, g^*) \setminus \{0\}$. While on the other hand, the continuity of $\tilde{P}(\omega)$ with ω implies that $I - \tilde{P}(\omega)$ is also continuous with respect to ω. So, $v_n = (I - \tilde{P}(u_{2n}, g_n))v_n \to (I - \tilde{P}(u^*, g^*))v^*$ as $n \to \infty$, that is $v^* \in V^s(u^*, g^*) \cap V^{cu}(u^*, g^*)$, a contradiction. Thus, we have proved our claim.

Since $\dim V^{cu}(u_1, g) = \dim V^{cu}(u_2, g) < \infty$, $V^s(u_1, g) \oplus V^{cu}(u_1, g) = X$, one has that $V^s(u_1, g) \oplus V^{cu}(u_2, g) = X$. Thus, there is a unique $u_1^s \in V^s(u_1, g)$ and a unique $u_2^{cu} \in V^{cu}(u_2, g)$ such that $u_1 - u_2 = u_2^{cu} - u_1^s$, that is $u_1 + u_1^s = u_2 + u_2^{cu}$. So, $(u_1 + V^s(u_1, g)) \cap (u_2 + V^{cu}(u_2, g)) \neq \emptyset$. □

Lemma 3.7. *Suppose that* $0 \in \sigma(\Omega)$. *Then for any* (u_1, y), $(u_2, y) \in \Omega$ *with* $\|u_1 - u_2\| \ll 1$, *one has that* $M^s(u_1, g, \delta^*) \cap M^{cu}(u_2, g, \delta^*) \neq \emptyset$, *and* $M^{cs}(u_1, g, \delta^*) \cap M^u(u_2, g, \delta^*) \neq \emptyset$.

Proof. We only prove that $M^s(u_1, g, \delta^*) \cap M^{cu}(u_2, g, \delta^*) \neq \emptyset$, for $\|u_1 - u_2\| \ll 1$. By Lemma 2.7 and (3.5), for any $\omega = (u_0, g) \in \Omega$, there are C^1 functions $h^s(\cdot, \omega) : V^s(\omega) \to V^{cu}(\omega)$, $h^{cu}(\cdot, \omega) : V^{cu}(\omega) \to V^s(\omega)$ such that $h^s(u, \omega)$, $h^{cu}(u, \omega) = o(\|u\|)$, $\|\partial h^{s,cu}(u, \omega)\| \leq K_0$ for $u \in V^{s,cu}(\omega)$, and

$$\begin{aligned} M^s(\omega, \delta^*) =& \{u_0 + u^s + h^s(u^s, u_0, g) : u^s \in V^s(\omega) \cap \{u \in X : \|u\| < \delta^*\}\} \\ M^{cu}(\omega, \delta^*) =& \{u_0 + u^{cu} + h^{cu}(u^{cu}, u_0, g) : u^{cu} \in V^{cu}(\omega) \cap \{u \in X : \|u\| < \delta^*\}\}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.18}$$

Now, by Lemma 3.6, there exists $\delta > 0$ such that for any (u_1, g), $(u_2, g) \in \Omega$ with $||u_1 - u_2|| < \delta$, one has $X = V^s(u_1, g) \oplus V^{cu}(u_2, g)$. Consider the mapping $Q(u_1, u_2, g) : X = V^s(u_1, g) \oplus V^{cu}(u_2, g) \to X : u = u_1^s + u_2^{cu} \mapsto u_2^{cu} - u_1^s$. It is easy to know that $Q(u_1, u_2, g)$ is an isomorphism.

Define $\tilde{Q}(u_1, u_2, g) : X = V^s(u_1, g) \oplus V^{cu}(u_2, g) \to X : u = u_1^s + u_2^{cu} \mapsto Q(u_1, u_2, g)(u_1^s + u_2^{cu}) + h^{cu}(u_2^{cu}, u_2, g) - h^s(u_1^s, u_1, g)$ with $\|u_1^s\| < \delta^*$, $\|u_2^{cu}\| < \delta^*$. Noticing that $\tilde{Q}(u_1, u_2, g)0 = 0$ and $|\partial h^{s,cu}(u, \omega_0)|$ are small, let $D_u\tilde{Q}(u_1, u_2, g)v = v_2^{cu} + h_u^{cu}(u_2^{cu}, u_2, g)v_2^{cu} - v_1^s - h_u^s(u_1^s, u_1, g)v_1^s$, here $v_1^s \in V^s(u_1, g)$, $v_2^{cu} \in V^{cu}(u_2, g)$ and $v = v_1^s + v_2^{cu}$. Then there is a $\delta_1 > 0$, such that for $\|u_1 - u_2\| < \delta_1$, $D_u\tilde{Q}(u_1, u_2, g)$ is a surjective map from $X \to X$. By the implicit function theorem, there is a $\delta_2 > 0$ such that, for any $\tilde{u} \in X$ with $\|\tilde{u}\| < \delta_2$ and $\|u_1 - u_2\| < \delta_1$, one has a unique solution $u = u_1^s + u_2^{cu}$ with $(u_1^s, u_2^{cu}) \in (V^s(u_1, g) \cap \{u \in X | \|u\| < \delta^*\}, V^{cu}(u_2, g) \cap \{u \in X | \|u\| < \delta^*\})$ satisfying $\tilde{Q}(u_1, u_2, g)u = \tilde{u}$. Particularly, for $\tilde{u} = u_1 - u_2$ with $\|u_1 - u_2\| < \min\{\delta, \delta_1, \delta_2\}$. That is $u_1 + u_1^s + h^s(u_1^s, u_1, g) = u_2 + u_2^{cu} + h^{cu}(u_2^{cu}, u_2, g)$. □

Hereafter, we will focus on a spatially inhomogeneous minimal set $M \subset X \times H(f)$ for (1.2). Let σ_a be the S^1-action on $u \in X$ induced by shifting x

$$(\sigma_a u)(x) := u(x + a), \quad a \in S^1 = \mathbb{R}/2\pi\mathbb{Z}. \tag{3.19}$$

Then $\Sigma M := \{\sigma_a u : a \in S^1, u \in M\}$. Since the group S^1 is compact and connected, ΣM is a connected and compact invariant subset in $X \times H(f)$. So the Sacker-Sell spectrum, as well as the stable, unstable, center, center-stable, and center-unstable subspaces at each $\omega \in \Sigma M$, are well defined.

Lemma 3.8. *Let M be a spatially inhomogeneous minimal set of (3.1). Assume that* $\dim V^c(\omega) = 1$, *or* $\dim V^c(\omega) = 2$ *with* $\dim V^u(\omega)$ *being odd. Then*

$$z(u_1(\cdot) - u_2(\cdot)) = N_u, \quad \textit{for any } (u_1, g), (u_2, g) \in M \textit{ with } u_1 \neq u_2,$$

where N_u are as in Corollary 3.5.

Proof. Fix (u_1, g), $(u_2, g) \in M$. We first claim that there is a sequence $t_n \to \infty$ such that $g \cdot t_n \to g^+$ and

$$\varphi(t_n, \cdot; u_1, g) \to u_1^+, \ \ \varphi(t_n, \cdot; u_2, g) \to u_2^+, \tag{3.20}$$

with $u_1^+ \in \Sigma u_2^+$. In fact, by taking a sequence $t_n \to \infty$, we may assume that $g \cdot t_n \to g^+$ and $\varphi(t_n, \cdot; u_1, g) \to u_1^+$, $\varphi(t_n, \cdot; u_2, g) \to u_2^+$. If $u_1^+ \in \Sigma u_2^+$, then the claim holds. If $u_1^+ \notin \Sigma u_2^+$, then by Lemma 2.4 and the connectivity of S^1, there is an integer $\tilde{N}$ such that

$$(\varphi(t, \cdot; u_1^+, g^+) - \varphi(t, \cdot; \sigma_a u_2^+, g^+)) = \tilde{N}, \quad \text{for all } t \in \mathbb{R} \text{ and } a \in S^1.$$

By the compactness of S^1, one can find a $T_0 > 0$ such that

$$z(\varphi(t, \cdot; u_1, g) - \varphi(t, \cdot; \sigma_a u_2, g)) = \tilde{N}, \quad \text{for all } t \geq T_0 \text{ and } a \in S^1.$$

As a consequence,

$$m_1(t) := \max_{x \in S^1} \varphi(t, x; u_1, g) \neq m_2(t) := \max_{x \in S^1} \varphi(t, x; u_2, g), \quad \text{for all } \ t \geq T_0.$$

Without loss of generality, we may assume that $m_1(t) > m_2(t)$ for all $t \geq T_0$. For the above g^+, let $m^+ = \max\{\max_{x\in S^1} v(x) : (v, g^+) \in M\}$ and u_2^{++} be such that $(u_2^{++}, g^+) \in M$ with $\max_{x\in S^1} u_2^{++}(x) = m^+$. Since M is minimal, one can take another sequence $t_n^+ \to \infty$ such that

$$(\varphi(t_n^+, \cdot; u_2, g), g \cdot t_n^+) \to (u_2^{++}(\cdot), g^+).$$

Without loss of generality, we assume that $\varphi(t_n^+, \cdot; u_1, g) \to u_1^{++}(\cdot)$. Then, by the definition of m^+, we must have

$$\max_{x\in S^1} u_1^{++}(x) = \max_{x\in S^1} u_2^{++}(x). \tag{3.21}$$

Suppose that $u_1^{++} \notin \Sigma_a u_2^{++}$. Then, again by Lemma 2.4 and the connectivity of S^1, there is $\tilde{N}^+$ such that

$$z(\varphi(t, \cdot; u_1^{++}, g^+) - \varphi(t, \cdot; \sigma_a u_2^{++}, g^+)) = \tilde{N}^+, \quad \forall\, t \in \mathbb{R},\ a \in S^1.$$

This contradicts to (3.21). Hence, $u_1^{++} \in \Sigma u_2^{++}$ and the claim is proved.

Together with the claim and the connectivity of $(S^1 \times S^1) \setminus \{(a, a)|a \in S^1\}$, it follows from Lemma 2.4 and (3.20) that there is a constant C such that

$$z(\varphi(t, \cdot; \sigma_b u_1^+, g^+) - \varphi(t, \cdot; \sigma_a u_2^+, g^+)) \equiv C,$$

whenever $t \in \mathbb{R}$ and $a, b \in S^1$ with $\sigma_b u_1^+ \neq \sigma_a u_2^+$. In particular,

$$z(\varphi(t, \cdot; u_1^+, g^+) - \varphi(t, \cdot; \sigma_a u_2^+, g^+)) \equiv C, \tag{3.22}$$

for any $t \in \mathbb{R}$, and $a \in S^1$ with $u_1^+ \neq \sigma_a u_2^+$. Recall that $u_1^+ = \sigma_{\tilde{a}} u_2^+$ for some $\tilde{a} \in S^1$, the spatial inhomogeneity of M enables us to find some $a_* \in S^1$ sufficiently close to $\tilde{a}$ such that $u_1^+ \neq \sigma_{a_*} u_2^+$; and moreover, due to the translation-group action σ on the semiflow, as well as the compactness and invariance of M, one has $||\varphi(t, \cdot; \sigma_{a_*} u_2^+, g^+) - \varphi(t, \cdot; u_1^+, g^+)||$ is sufficiently small uniformly for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$. This then implies that $\sigma_{a_*} u_2^+ \in M^{cs}(u_1^+, g^+, \delta^*)$. Therefore, by virtue of Corollary 3.5, one obtains that

$$z(u_1^+ - \sigma_{a_*} u_2^+) \geq N_u.$$

Together with (3.22), we have $C \geq N_u$. So

$$z(\varphi(t, \cdot; u_1^+, g^+) - \varphi(t, \cdot; \sigma_a u_2^+, g^+)) \geq N_u, \tag{3.23}$$

for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$ and $a \in S^1$ with $u_1^+ \neq \sigma_a u_2^+$.

We now will show that

$$z(\varphi(t, \cdot; u_1, g) - \varphi(t, \cdot; u_2, g)) \geq N_u, \quad \text{for } t \geq 0 \text{ sufficiently large}. \tag{3.24}$$

In fact, we note (3.20). If $u_1^+ \neq u_2^+$, then (3.23) entails that $z(u_1^+(\cdot) - u_2^+(\cdot)) \geq N_u$ and $u_1^+(\cdot) - u_2^+(\cdot)$ can only have simple zeros; and hence, we have already obtained that $z(\varphi(t, \cdot; u_1, g) -$

$\varphi(t,\cdot;u_2,g)) \geq N_u$ for $t \gg 1$. If $u_1^+ = u_2^+$, it then follows from Lemma 2.3(c) that there is an integer N_0 such that $z(\varphi(t,\cdot;u_1,g) - \varphi(t,\cdot;u_2,g)) = N_0$ for all t sufficiently positive. Fix an $n_0 \gg 1$ in (3.20), one can obtain a neighborhood $B(e)$ of the unit e in the group S^1 such that $z(\varphi(t_{n_0},\cdot;u_1,g) - \varphi(t_{n_0},\cdot;\sigma_a u_2,g)) = N_0$ for any $a \in B(e)$. So, by Lemma 2.3(c) again, we have $N_0 \geq z(\varphi(t,\cdot;u_1,g) - \varphi(t,\cdot;\sigma_a u_2,g))$ for any $t \geq t_{n_0}$ and any $a \in B(e)$. Note that there is at least some $a_0 \in B(e)$ such that $u_1^+ \neq \sigma_{a_0} u_2^+$ (Otherwise, $\sigma_a u_2^+ = u_1^+ = u_2^+$ for any $a \in B(e)$, which implies that u_2^+ is spatially homogenous, a contradiction). Then, again by Lemma 2.4 and (3.20), one obtains that $z(\varphi(t,\cdot;u_1^+,g^+) - \varphi(t,\cdot;\sigma_{a_0}u_2^+,g^+)) \equiv \text{constant} \leq N_0$. Combining with (3.23), we obtain that $N_0 \geq N_u$. Thus, we have proved (3.24).

Next, we will prove that

$$z(\varphi(t,\cdot;u_1,g) - \varphi(t,\cdot;u_2,g)) \leq N_u, \quad \text{for } t \text{ sufficiently negative.} \tag{3.25}$$

If $||\varphi(t,\cdot;u_1,g) - \varphi(t,\cdot;u_2,g)|| \to 0$ as $t \to -\infty$, then $\varphi(t,\cdot;u_2,g) \in M^{cu}(\varphi(t,\cdot;u_1,g), g\cdot t, \delta^*)$ for all t sufficiently negative. By Corollary 3.5(3)-(4), it follows that (3.25) holds already. Hereafter, we assume that

$$||\varphi(t,\cdot;u_1,g) - \varphi(t,\cdot;u_2,g)|| \nrightarrow 0 \ \text{ as } \ t \to -\infty. \tag{3.26}$$

Similarly as the claim above, one may obtain a sequence $s_n \to -\infty$ such that $g \cdot s_n \to g^-$ and

$$\varphi(s_n,\cdot;u_1,g) \to u_1^-, \ \ \varphi(s_n,\cdot;u_2,g) \to u_2^-, \tag{3.27}$$

with $u_1^- \in \Sigma u_2^-$. Moreover, by repeating the similar argument as above, we can utilize the estimate of the zero-number z on $M^{cu}(\omega,\delta^*)$ in Corollary 3.5(3)-(4) to obtain

$$z(\varphi(t,\cdot;u_1^-,g^-) - \varphi(t,\cdot;\sigma_a u_2^-,g^-)) \leq N_u, \tag{3.28}$$

for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$ and $a \in S^1$ with $u_1 \neq \sigma_a u_2^-$.

So, if $u_1^- \neq u_2^-$, then (3.28) entails that $z(u_1^-(\cdot) - u_2^-(\cdot)) \leq N_u$ and $u_1^-(\cdot) - u_2^-(\cdot)$ can only have simple zeros; and hence, by (3.27) we have already obtained that $z(\varphi(t,\cdot;u_1,g) - \varphi(t,\cdot;u_2,g)) \leq N_u$ for t sufficiently negative. For the case $u_1^- = u_2^-$, recall that $||\varphi(t,\cdot;u_1,g) - \varphi(t,\cdot;u_2,g)|| \nrightarrow 0$ as $t \to -\infty$ in (3.26). Then we can still find an integer N_0 such that $z(\varphi(t,\cdot;u_1,g) - \varphi(t,\cdot;u_2,g)) = N_0$ for all t sufficiently negative. Hence, one can repeat the similar argument immediately after (3.24) to obtain that $N_0 \leq N_u$. Thus, we have proved (3.25).

By virtue of (3.24) and (3.25), we have obtained

$$z(\varphi(t,\cdot;u_1,g) - \varphi(t,\cdot;u_2,g)) = N_u, \quad \forall\, t \in \mathbb{R},$$

which completes the proof. □

For all $u \in X$, we write $m(u)$ as the maximum of u on S^1, and define an equivalence relation on X by declaim $u \sim v$ if and only if $u = \sigma_a v$ for some $a \in S^1$. The equivalence class is denoted by $[u]$. Then we have the following very useful Corollary.

Corollary 3.9. *Let M be a minimal set of (3.1). Assume that M is spatially inhomogeneous and* $\dim V^c(\omega) = 1$, *or* $\dim V^c(\omega) = 2$ *with* $\dim V^u(\omega)$ *being odd. Then, for any $g \in H(f)$ and any two elements $(u_1, g), (u_2, g)$ in $M \cap p^{-1}(g)$, one has:*

- (i) $z(\varphi(t, \cdot; u_1, g) - \varphi(t, \cdot; \sigma_a u_2, g)) = N_u$, *for any $a \in S^1$ with $\sigma_a u_2 \neq u_1$.*
- (ii) *If $m(u_1) < m(u_2)$, then $m(\varphi(t, \cdot; u_1, g)) < m(\varphi(t, \cdot; u_2, g))$, for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$.*
- (iii) $m(u_1) = m(u_2) \Leftrightarrow ([u_1], g) = ([u_2], g)$.

Proof. (i) can be obtained by repeating the same arguments in Lemma 3.8.

(ii) Since $m(u_1) < m(u_2)$, it follows that $u_1 \neq \sigma_a u_2$ for any $a \in S^1$. By virtue of (i),

$$z(\varphi(t, \cdot; u_1, g) - \varphi(t, \cdot; \sigma_a u_2, g)) = N_u, \tag{3.29}$$

for any $a \in S^1$ and $t \in \mathbb{R}$. Suppose that there is a $t_0 > 0$ (resp. $t_0 < 0$), such that $m(u(t_0, \cdot; u_1, g)) \geq m(u(t_0, \cdot; u_2, g))$. Let $K(t) = m(\varphi(t, \cdot; u_1, g)) - m(\varphi(t, \cdot; u_2, g))$, $t \in \mathbb{R}$. Then $K(t)$ is continuous for $t \in \mathbb{R}$. Moreover, one has $K(0) < 0$ and $K(t_0) \geq 0$. So one can find a $t_1 \in (0, t_0]$ (resp. $t_1 \in [t_0, 0)$) such that $m(\varphi(t_1, \cdot; u_1, g)) = m(\varphi(t_1, \cdot; u_2, g))$. Hence, there exist some $a_0 \in \mathbb{S}^1$ and $x_0 \in \mathbb{S}^1$ such that $\varphi(t_1, x_0; u_1, g) = m(\varphi(t_1, \cdot; u_1, g)) = \varphi(t_1, x_0 + a_0; u_2, g) = \varphi(t_1, x_0; \sigma_{a_0} u_2, g)$ and $\varphi_x(t_1, x_0; u_1, g) = 0 = \varphi_x(t_1, x_0; \sigma_{a_0} u_2, g)$. Then Lemma 2.3(b) implies that $z(\varphi(t, \cdot; u_1, g) - \varphi(t, \cdot; \sigma_a u_2, g))$ must be dropped at $t = t_1$, contradicting (3.29).

(iii) Clearly, $([u_1], g) = ([u_2], g)$ implies $m(u_1) = m(u_2)$. If $m(u_1) = m(u_2)$, then there exists some $a_0 \in \mathbb{S}^1$ such that $u_1 - \sigma_{a_0} u_2$ possesses a multiplier zero. So, we must have $u_1 = \sigma_{a_0} u_2$ (Otherwise, by (i), $u_1 \neq \sigma_{a_0} u_2$ will imply that $z(\varphi(t, \cdot; u_1, g) - \varphi(t, \cdot; \sigma_{a_0} u_2, g)) = N_u$ for all t; and hence, $u_1 - \sigma_{a_0} u_2$ possesses only simple zeros, a contradiction). Thus, $([u_1], g) = ([u_2], g)$. We have completed the proof. ☐

Now we define by $\tilde{X}$ the quotient space "$X/\sim$" of X. Then $\tilde{X}$ is a metric space with metric $\tilde{d}_{\tilde{X}}$ defined as $\tilde{d}_{\tilde{X}}([u], [v]) := d_H(\Sigma u, \Sigma v)$ for any $[u], [v] \in \tilde{X}$. Here $d_H(U, V)$ is the Hausdorff metric of the compact subsets U, V in X, defined as $d_H(U, V) = \sup\{\sup_{u \in U} \inf_{v \in V} d_X(u, v), \sup_{v \in V} \inf_{u \in U} d_X(u, v)\}$ where the metric $d_X(u, v) = ||u - v||_X$. It is clear that d_X satisfies the S^1-translation invariance that is $d_X(\sigma_a u, \sigma_a v) = d_X(u, v)$ for any $u, v \in X$ and any $a \in S^1$. If we denote the metric on $H(f)$ by d_Y, one has the product metric d on $X \times H(f)$ by setting $d((u_1, g_1), (u_2, g_2)) = d_X(u_1, u_2) + d_Y(g_1, g_2)$ for any two points $(u_1, g_1), (u_2, g_2) \in X \times H(f)$, then $\tilde{d}$ is the induced metric on $\tilde{X} \times H(f)$ defined as $\tilde{d}(([u], g_1), ([v], g_2)) = \tilde{d}_{\tilde{X}}([u], [v]) + d_Y(g_1, g_2)$. For any subset $K \subset X \times H(f)$, we write $\tilde{K} = \{([u], g) \in \tilde{X} \times H(f) | (u, g) \in K\}$.

By virtue of Corollary 3.9, we consider the induced mapping $\tilde{\Pi}^t$, $t \geq 0$, as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} &\tilde{\Pi}^t : \tilde{X} \times H(f) \to \tilde{X} \times H(f); \\ &\qquad ([u], g) \to (\tilde{\varphi}(t, \cdot; [u], g), g \cdot t) := ([\varphi(t, \cdot; u, g)], g \cdot t). \end{aligned} \tag{3.30}$$

Lemma 3.10. (i) *$\tilde{\Pi}^t$ is a skew-product semiflow on $\tilde{X} \times H(f)$;*

(ii) *If M is a minimal invariant subset in $X \times H(f)$ w.r.t. Π^t, then $\tilde{M}$ is a minimal invariant subset in $\tilde{X} \times H(f)$ w.r.t. $\tilde{\Pi}^t$.*

Proof. (i). For any $([u], g) \in \tilde{X} \times H(f)$ and any $t, s \geq 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{\Pi}^{t+s}([u], g) &= ([\varphi(t+s, \cdot; u, g)], g \cdot (t+s)) = ([\varphi(s, \cdot; \varphi(t, \cdot; u, g), g \cdot t)], g \cdot (t+s)) \\ &= (\tilde{\varphi}(s, \cdot; [\varphi(t, \cdot; u, g], g \cdot t), (g \cdot t) \cdot s) = (\tilde{\varphi}(s, \cdot; \tilde{\Pi}^t([u], g)), (g \cdot t) \cdot s) \\ &= \tilde{\Pi}^s(\tilde{\Pi}^t([u], g)).\end{aligned}$$

So, $\tilde{\Pi}^t$ admits the cocycle property. Since $\mathbb{R}^+$ is a Baire space and $\tilde{X} \times H(f)$ is metrizable, it suffices to verify (see e.g., [4, Theorem 1]) the continuity of $\tilde{\Pi}$ with respect to each variable. Here we only show the continuity in $([u], g) \in \tilde{X} \times H(f)$. The continuity with respect to other variables can be proved similarly. Since Π^t is continuous on $X \times H(f)$, it follows that for any (u_0, g_0) and any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists a $\delta > 0$ such that $d(\Pi^t(u_0, g_0), \Pi^t(u, g)) < \varepsilon$ for any $(u, g) \in X \times H(f)$ with $d((u_0, g_0), (u, g)) < \delta$. Fix $([u_0], g_0) \in \tilde{X} \times H(f)$, then for any $([u], g) \in \tilde{X} \times H(f)$ with $\tilde{d}(([u_0], g_0), ([u], g)) < \delta$, one has $d_H(\Sigma u_0, \Sigma u) + d_Y(g_0, g) < \delta$. So we can find some $a \in S^1$ such that $d((u_0, g_0), (\sigma_a u, g)) < \delta$, and hence, $d(\Pi^t(u_0, g_0), \Pi^t(\sigma_a u, g)) < \varepsilon$. Thus, we get $\tilde{d}(\tilde{\Pi}^t([u_0], g_0), \tilde{\Pi}^t([u], g)) < \varepsilon$, which completes the proof of (i).

(ii). Given any two points $([u], g), ([u_0], g) \in \tilde{M}$, by the minimality of M there exists a sequence $t_n \to +\infty$ (as $n \to \infty$) such that

$$\Pi^{t_n}(u_0, g_0) \to (u, g) \tag{3.31}$$

as $n \to \infty$. In order to show that $\tilde{\Pi}^{t_n}([u_0], g_0) \to ([u], g)$ as $n \to \infty$, it suffices to prove that $\tilde{d}_{\tilde{X}}([\varphi(t_n, \cdot; u_0, g_0)], [u]) \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$. To this end, it follows from (3.31) that $\varphi(t_n, \cdot; u_0, g_0) \to u$ in X. So, by the translation-invariance of G-group action, one has $d_X(\sigma_a \varphi(t_n, \cdot; u_0, g_0), \sigma_a u) = d_X(\varphi(t_n, \cdot; u_0, g_0), u) \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$ uniformly for $a \in S^1$. Therefore, one has

$$\inf_{b \in S^1} d_X(\sigma_a \varphi(t_n, \cdot; u_0, g_0), \Sigma_b u) \leq d_X(\sigma_a \varphi(t_n, \cdot; u_0, g_0), \sigma_a u) \to 0 \tag{3.32}$$

as $n \to \infty$ uniformly for $a \in S^1$. On the other hand, we know that

$$\inf_{b \in S^1} d_X(\sigma_b \varphi(t_n, \cdot; u_0, g_0), \sigma_a u) \leq d_X(\sigma_a \varphi(t_n, \cdot; u_0, g_0), \sigma_a u) \to 0. \tag{3.33}$$

Thus, from (3.32) and (3.33), Hausdorff metric $d_H(\Sigma(\varphi(t_n, \cdot; u_0, g)), \Sigma u) \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$. Recall that

$$\tilde{d}_{\tilde{X}}([\varphi(t_n, \cdot; u_0, g_0)], [u]) = d_H(\Sigma(\varphi(t_n, \cdot; u_0, g_0)), \Sigma u).$$

It entails that $\tilde{d}_{\tilde{X}}([\varphi(t_n, \cdot; u_0, g_0)], [u]) \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$. We have proved that $\tilde{M}$ is a minimal invariant set in $\tilde{X} \times H(f)$. $\square$

Let $\tilde{p} : \tilde{X} \times H(f) \to H(f)$ be the natural projection and M be a spatially inhomogeneous minimal set of (3.1) with $\dim V^c(\omega) = 1$, or $\dim V^c(\omega) = 2$ and $\dim V^u(\omega)$ being odd. By virtue of Corollary 3.9(iii), one can define an ordering on each fiber $\tilde{M} \cap \tilde{p}^{-1}(g)$, with the base point $g \in H(f)$ as follows:

$$([u], g) \le_g ([v], g) \;\text{ if }\; m(u) \le m(v).$$

We also write the strict relation $([u], g) <_g ([v], g)$ if $m(u) < m(v)$. Without any confusion, we hereafter will drop the subscript "g".

Lemma 3.11. *" $\le$ " is a total ordering on each $\tilde{M} \cap \tilde{p}^{-1}(g)$, $(g \in H(f))$ and $\tilde{\Pi}^t$ is strictly order preserving on $\tilde{M}$ in the sense that, for any $g \in H(f)$, $([u], g) < ([v], g)$ implies that $\tilde{\Pi}^t([u], g) < \tilde{\Pi}^t([v], g)$ for all $t \ge 0$.*

Proof. This is a direct result of Corollary 3.9 (ii)-(iii). ☐

Let $E \subset \tilde{X} \times H(f)$ be a compact invariant subset of $\tilde{\Pi}^t$ which admits a flow extension. For each $g \in H(f)$, we define *a fiberwise strong ordering " $\ll$ " on each fiber* $E \cap \tilde{p}^{-1}(g)$ as follows: $([u_1], g) \ll ([u_2], g)$ if there exist neighborhoods $\mathcal{N}_1, \mathcal{N}_2 \subset E \cap \tilde{p}^{-1}(g)$ of $([u_1], g), ([u_2], g)$, respectively, such that $([u_1^*], g) < ([u_2^*], g)$ for all $([u_i^*], g) \in \mathcal{N}_i$ $(i = 1, 2)$.

Moreover, for each $g \in H(f)$, we call $([u_1], g), ([u_2], g)$ forms *a strongly order-preserving pair* if $([u_1], g), ([u_2], g)$ is strongly ordered on the fiber, say $([u_1], g) \ll ([u_2], g)$, and there are neighborhoods U_i of $([u_i], g)$ $(i = 1, 2)$ in E respectively, such that whenever $([u_1^*], g), ([u_2^*], g) \in E \cap \tilde{p}^{-1}(g)$, with $\tilde{\Pi}^T([u_1^*], g) \in U_i$ $(i = 1, 2)$ for some $T < 0$, then $([u_1^*], g) \ll ([u_2^*], g)$.

The following lemma is essentially from [28] and will play an important role in our proof.

Lemma 3.12. *Let E be a minimal set of $\tilde{\Pi}^t$ which admits a flow extension and Y' be as in Lemma 2.1. Then for any $g \in Y'$, $E \cap \tilde{p}^{-1}(g)$ admits no strongly order preserving pair.*

Proof. One can repeat the arguments in [28, Theorem II.3.1] to obtain this lemma. ☐

Now we are ready to prove Theorem 3.1.

Proof of Theorem 3.1. (1) Let $Y_0 = Y'$, where Y' is defined as in Lemma 2.1. By virtue of Lemma 3.10, we consider the induced invariant minimal set $\tilde{M}$ for the skew-product semiflow $\tilde{\Pi}^t$ on $\tilde{X} \times H(f)$.

In order to prove the statement of Theorem 3.1(1), we first show that for any $g \in Y_0$, there exists $u_g \in X$ such that $M \cap p^{-1}(g) \subset (\Sigma u_g, g)$. To this end, it suffices to prove that $\tilde{M} \cap \tilde{p}^{-1}(g)$ is a singleton. Suppose that there are two distinct points $([u_1], g), ([u_2], g)$ on $\tilde{M} \cap \tilde{p}^{-1}(g)$ for some $g \in Y_0$. It then follows from Lemma 3.11 that $([u_1], g)$ and $([u_2], g)$ is strictly order related, say $([u_1], g) < ([u_2], g)$. Then, by the order defined before Lemma 3.11, we have $m(u_1) < m(u_2)$.

We prove that $([u_1], g)$ and $([u_2], g)$ are strongly ordered. In fact, let $\varepsilon_0 = m(u_2) - m(u_1)$. Because $m(u)$ is continuous with respect to $u \in X$, there is a $\delta > 0$ such that

$$|m(\tilde{u}) - m(u_1)| < \frac{\varepsilon_0}{4} \text{ (resp. } |m(\tilde{u}) - m(u_2)| < \frac{\varepsilon_0}{4}) \tag{3.34}$$

for any $(\tilde{u}, g) \in X \times H(f)$ with $d_X(\tilde{u}, u_1) < \delta$ (resp. $d_X(\tilde{u}, u_2) < \delta$). For such $\delta > 0$ and $i = 1, 2$, we define the neighborhoods $\mathcal{N}_i = \{([u_i^*], g) \in \tilde{M} \mid \tilde{d}_{\tilde{X}}([u_i^*], [u_i]) < \delta\}$ of $([u_i], g)$. Then if $([u_i^*], g) \in \mathcal{N}_i$, one can find some $a_i \in S^1$ such that $d_X(\sigma_{a_i} u_i^*, u_i) < \delta$. As a consequence, by (3.34), we have $|m(\sigma_{a_i} u_i^*) - m(u_i)| < \frac{\varepsilon_0}{4}$, which implies that

$$m(u_1^*) = m(\sigma_{a_1} u_1^*) < m(\sigma_{a_2} u_2^*) - \frac{\varepsilon_0}{2} = m(u_2^*) - \frac{\varepsilon_0}{2}. \tag{3.35}$$

By the definition of order defined in $\tilde{M} \cap \tilde{p}^{-1}(g)$, $g \in H(f)$ it entails that $([u_1^*], g) < ([u_2^*], g)$. Thus we have shown that $([u_1], g) \ll ([u_2], g)$.

We now claim that, $([u_1], g)$ and $([u_2], g)$ forms a strongly order preserving pair. Indeed, for each $i = 1, 2$, we define a neighborhood $U_i = \{([v_i], h) | \tilde{d}(([u_i], g), ([v_i], h)) < \delta\}$ of $([u_i], g)$ in $\tilde{M}$. Given any $([u_i^*], g) \in \tilde{M} \cap \tilde{p}^{-1}(g)$ with $\tilde{\Pi}^T([u_i^*], g) \in U_i$ for some $T < 0$, we write $\tilde{\Pi}^T([u_i^*], g) = (\tilde{\varphi}(T, [u_i^*], g), g \cdot T) \in U_i$. So $\tilde{d}_{\tilde{X}}(\tilde{\varphi}(T, [u_i^*], g), [u_i]) < \delta$ for $i = 1, 2$. Recall that $m(u_1) < m(u_2)$, one can repeat the arguments for proving (3.35) in the previous paragraph to obtain that $m(\varphi(T, u_1^*, g)) < m(\varphi(T, u_2^*, g))$. It then follows from the definition of the order defined in the fiber $\tilde{M} \cap \tilde{p}^{-1}(g \cdot T)$ that $\tilde{\varphi}(T, [u_1^*], g) < \tilde{\varphi}(T, [u_2^*], g)$. Combining with the order-preserving property of $\tilde{\Pi}^t (t \geq 0)$ in Lemma 4.3, we obtain that

$$([u_1^*], g) = \tilde{\Pi}^{-T}(\tilde{\varphi}(T, [u_1^*], g), g \cdot T) < \tilde{\Pi}^{-T}(\tilde{\varphi}(T, [u_2^*], g), g \cdot T) = ([u_2^*], g).$$

Thus, we have proved the claim. On the other hand, Lemma 3.12 implies that there exists no such strongly order preserving pair on $\tilde{M} \cap \tilde{p}^{-1}(g)$, a contradiction. Thus, we have proved that for any $g \in Y_0$, $\tilde{M} \cap \tilde{p}^{-1}(g)$ is a singleton. Thus, we have proved $M \cap p^{-1}(g) \subset (\Sigma u_g, g)$ for some $u_g \in X$.

Next, we will prove that M can be residually embedded into an almost automorphic forced flow on S^1. Let Y_0 be as above. For given $g \in Y_0$, let u_g be such that

$$\tilde{M} \cap \tilde{p}^{-1}(g) = ([u_g], g) \;\; (\text{hence } M \cap p^{-1}(g) = (\Sigma u_g, g)) \quad \text{and} \quad u_g(0) = m(u_g). \tag{3.36}$$

By Corollary 3.9(i) and the spatial inhomogeneity of M, it is also not difficult to see that

$$u_g''(0) \neq 0 \quad \text{and} \quad u_g(x) < u_g(0) \;\; \text{for any } x \in (0, L), \tag{3.37}$$

where $L \in (0, 2\pi]$ is the minimal period of $u_g(x)$.

By virtue of Corollary 3.9(iii), given any $g \in Y_0$, the function $t \mapsto m^g(t) := u_{g\cdot t}(0)$ is almost automorphic in t; and moreover, $u^g(t, x) := u_{g\cdot t}(x)$ is almost automorphic in t uniformly in x. Define a non-negative function $t \mapsto c^g(t) \geq 0$ such that

$$\varphi(t, x; u_g, g) = u_{g\cdot t}(x + c^g(t)), \quad \text{or equivalently,} \quad \varphi(t, x - c^g(t); u_g, g) = u_{g\cdot t}(x). \tag{3.38}$$

Since $u_g(x)$ is L-periodic, one has $\varphi(t, x; u_g, g)$ is L-periodic in x; and hence, $u_{g\cdot t}(x)$ is L-periodic in x as well. So, for each $t \in \mathbb{R}$, we can choose $c^g(t) \in \mathcal{S}^1 := \mathbb{R}/L\mathbb{Z}$ so that $c^g(t)$ is continuous in t. Indeed, suppose there is a sequence $t_n \to t_0$ such that $|c^g(t_0) - c^g(t_n)| \geq \epsilon_0 > 0$ in $\mathcal{S}^1$.

Without loss of generality, we assume $c^g(t_n) \to c^*$ with $c^* \in \mathcal{S}^1$. So, $c^g(t_0) \neq c^*$ in $\mathcal{S}^1$. On the other hand, by (3.38), one has $u_{g\cdot t_0}(x + c^g(t_0)) = u_{g\cdot t_0}(x + c^*)$. This contradicts $c^g(t_0) \neq c^*$ with $c^g(t_0), c^* \in \mathcal{S}^1$, because L is the minimal period. So, the function $t \mapsto c^g(t) \in \mathcal{S}^1$ is continuous.

By (3.38) and the definition of $u_{g\cdot t}(x)$, we observe that

$$\varphi_x(t, -c^g(t); u_g, g) = u^{'}_{g\cdot t}(0) = 0$$

and

$$\varphi_{xx}(t, -c^g(t); u_g, g) = u^{''}_{g\cdot t}(0) \neq 0.$$

Then by the continuity of $c^g(t)$ in t and Implicit Function Theorem, we have $c^g(t)$ is differentiable in t; and moreover, we have

$$\dot{c}^g(t) = G(t, c^g(t)), \tag{3.39}$$

where

$$G(t, z) = g_p(t, \varphi(t, -z; u_g, g), \varphi_x(t, -z; u_g, g)) + \frac{\varphi_{xxx}(t, -z; u_g, g)}{\varphi_{xx}(t, -z; u_g, g)}, \quad \text{for } z \in \mathcal{S}^1.$$

It is not difficult to see that $G(t, z+L) = G(t, z)$ and $G(t, z)$ is almost automorphic in t uniformly for $z \in \mathcal{S}^1$. Consequently, we have obtained that (3.39) is an almost automorphic forced equation on S^1. Thus, (1) directly follows from (3.38) and (3.39).

(2) Note that Corollary 3.9 also holds for the case $\dim V^c(\omega) = 1$. Then one can repeat the same argument in (1) to obtain a residual invariant subset $Y_0 \subset H(f)$ such that $\tilde{M} \cap \tilde{p}^{-1}(g)$ is a singleton for any $g \in Y_0$. In order to show $Y_0 = H(f)$, we first note that, for any $(u_0, g) \in \Sigma M$, if $a \in S^1$ is close to e, then

$$||\varphi(t, \cdot; \sigma_a u_0, g) - \varphi(t, \cdot; u_0, g)|| \text{ is sufficiently small, for all } t \in \mathbb{R}.$$

It then follows that that $\sigma_a u_0 \in M^c((u_0, g), \delta^*)$ whenever $a \in S^1$ is close to e. Together with $\dim V^c(\omega) = 1$, one has

$$M^c((u_0, g), \delta^*) \subset \Sigma u_0, \quad \text{for any } (u_0, g) \in \Sigma M. \tag{3.40}$$

Moreover, due to Corollary 3.5(3), one of the following two cases must occur:

(A): $z(u(\cdot) - u_0(\cdot)) > N_u$, for $u \in M^s((u_0, g), \delta^*) \setminus \{u_0\}$; or otherwise

(B): $z(u(\cdot) - u_0(\cdot)) < N_u$, for $u \in M^u((u_0, g), \delta^*) \setminus \{u_0\}$.

In the following, we will prove $Y_0 = H(f)$ for case (A), and the proof for case (B) is analogous.

Suppose that there exist $g \in H(f) \setminus Y_0$ and $(u_1, g), (u_2, g) \in M$ such that $[u_1] \neq [u_2]$. Then it follows from Corollary 3.9(i) that $z(\varphi(t, \cdot; u_1, g) - \varphi(t, \cdot; \sigma_a u_2, g)) = N_u$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$ and $a \in S^1$. Moreover, by the compactness of S^1, there exists $\delta > 0$ (independent of $a \in S^1$) such that

$$z(u_1 - \sigma_a u_2 + v) = N_u \quad \text{for any } a \in S^1 \text{ and } \|v\| < \delta. \tag{3.41}$$

Fix some $(u^+, g^+) \in M$ with $g^+ \in Y_0$, then there exists a sequence $t_n \to \infty$ and some $b \in S^1$ such that $g \cdot t_n \to g^+$,

$$\varphi(t_n, \cdot; u_1, g) \to u^+, \;\; \varphi(t_n, \cdot; u_2, g) \to \sigma_b u^+.$$

Let $u_3 = \sigma_{-b} u_2 \in \Sigma M$. Then $\varphi(t_n, \cdot; u_1, g) \to u^+$, $\varphi(t_n, \cdot; u_3, g) \to u^+$. By virtue of Lemma 3.7, one can find some $v^* \in M^u(\varphi(t_n, \cdot; u_1, g), \delta^*) \cap M^{cs}(\varphi(t_n, \cdot; u_3, g), \delta^*)$ for t_n sufficiently large.

We now claim that $v^* \notin M^c(\varphi(t_n, \cdot; u_3, g), \delta^*)$. For otherwise, (3.40) implies that $v^* = \sigma_{a^*} \varphi(t_n, \cdot; u_3, g)$ for some $a^* \in S^1$. Note also that $v^* \in M^u(\varphi(t_n, \cdot; u_1, g), \delta^*)$, then

$$\|\sigma_{a^*} u_3 - u_1\| = ||\varphi(-t_n, \cdot; v^*, g \cdot t_n) - u_1|| \leq C e^{-\frac{\alpha}{2} t_n} \|v^* - \varphi(t_n, \cdot; u_1, g)\|. \tag{3.42}$$

As a consequence, by letting t_n large enough, one has $\|\sigma_{a^*} u_3 - u_1\| < \min\{\delta^*, \epsilon_0\}$, where $\epsilon_0 = |m(u_1) - m(u_2)| > 0$. This contradicts to $\|\sigma_{a^*} u_3 - u_1\| \geq |m(u_1) - m(u_2)|$. Thus, we have proved the claim.

Recall that $v^* \in M^{cs}(\varphi(t_n, \cdot; u_3, g), \delta^*)$. Then it follows from Remark 3.2 and (3.40) that there is some $a_0 \in S^1$ such that $v^* \in M^s(\sigma_{a_0} \varphi(t_n, \cdot; u_3, g), \delta^*)$ with $\sigma_{a_0} \varphi(t_n, \cdot; u_3, g) \in M^c(\varphi(t_n, \cdot; u_3, g), \delta^*)$. Since case (A) holds, we obtain $z(v^* - \sigma_{a_0} \varphi(t_n, \cdot; u_3, g)) > N_u$, and hence,

$$z(\varphi(-t_n, \cdot; v^*, g \cdot t_n) - \sigma_{a_0} u_3) > N_u. \tag{3.43}$$

On the other hand, one can deduce from (3.42) that $\|\varphi(-t_n, \cdot; v^*, g \cdot t_n) - u_1\| < \delta$, for t_n sufficiently large. Here $\delta > 0$ is in (3.41). Then (3.41) implies that $z(\varphi(-t_n, \cdot; v^*, g \cdot t_n) - \sigma_{a_0} u_3) = z(\varphi(-t_n, \cdot; v^*, g \cdot t_n) - u_1 + u_1 - \sigma_{a_0} u_3) = z(u_1 - \sigma_{a_0} u_3) = z(u_1 - \sigma_{a_0 - b} u_2) = N_u$, contradicting (3.43). Consequently, we have proved $Y_0 = H(f)$.

Therefore, one has $M \cap p^{-1}(g) = (\Sigma u_g, g)$ for any $g \in H(f)$, where u_g is defined in (3.36). So, $u_{g \cdot t}(x)$ is almost periodic in t uniformly in $x \in \mathcal{S}^1$; and moreover, $G(t, z)$ in (3.39) is almost periodic in t uniformly for $z \in \mathcal{S}^1$. Thus, we have completed the proof of Theorem 3.1. □

Proof of Theorem 3.2. (1) Suppose that $\dim V^c(\omega) > 2$. Then there exists some integer $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that the center space $V^c(\omega)$ has an exponentially separated invariant splitting $V^c(\omega) = W_k(\omega) \bigoplus \hat{F}(\omega)$. Here $W_k(\omega)$ is a Floquet space with $\dim W_k(\omega) = 2$ or 1, which is defined in Lemma 2.5.

Since M is unique ergodic, M possesses a pure point Sacker-Sell spectrum. So, for any $v \in V^c(\omega) \setminus \{0\}$, one has

$$\lim_{t \to \infty} \frac{\ln ||\Psi(t, \omega) v||}{t} = 0.$$

In particular, $\lim_{t \to \infty} \frac{\ln ||\Psi(t,\omega) v_1||}{t} = 0 = \lim_{t \to \infty} \frac{\ln ||\Psi(t,\omega) v_2||}{t}$, for any $v_1 \in W_k(\omega) \setminus \{0\}$, $v_2 \in \hat{F}(\omega) \setminus \{0\}$. This contradicts the exponentially separated property between $W_k(\omega)$ and $\hat{F}(\omega)$. Therefore, we have obtained $\dim V^c(\omega) \leq 2$.

We then have either (i) $\dim V^c(\omega) = 0$ or $\dim V^c(\omega) = 1$ or (ii) $\dim V^c(\omega) = 2$. Moreover, by Lemma 2.5 and the similar arguments in the previous paragraph, we must have $\dim V^u(\omega)$ is odd provided that $\dim V^c(\omega) = 2$.

(2) Since M is spatially homogeneous, the variational equation associated with any solution in M turns out to be as $v_t = v_{xx} + a(t)v_x + b(t)v$ with periodic boundary condition. Using the transform $w = v(t, x + c(t))$ (with $\dot{c}(t) = -a(t)$), we get $w_t = w_{xx} + b(t)w$; and moreover, by using another transformation $\hat{w} = we^{-\int_0^t b(s)ds}$, one obtains that $\hat{w}_t = \hat{w}_{xx}$. So, it follows that the transform $\hat{w} = v(t, x + c(t))e^{-\int_0^t b(s)ds}$ (and hence, $v(t, x) = e^{\int_0^t b(s)ds}\hat{w}(t, x - c(t))$) results in a simple equation $\hat{w}_t = \hat{w}_{xx}$. Note that $\hat{w}_t = \hat{w}_{xx}$ possesses the simplest "sin-cos"-mode eigenfunctions as $w_k(t, x) = e^{-(2k\pi)^2 t}\sin 2k\pi x, e^{-(2k\pi)^2 t}\cos 2k\pi x$ associated with the same eigenvalue $\lambda_k = -(2k\pi)^2$, $k = 0, 1, \cdots$. Then it yields that $v_k(t, x) = e^{-(2k\pi)^2 t + \int_0^t b(s)ds}\sin 2k\pi(x - c(t)), e^{-(2k\pi)^2 t + \int_0^t b(s)ds}\cos 2k\pi(x - c(t))$. This immediately implies that, if $V^u(\omega) \neq \{0\}$, then $\dim V^u(\omega)$ must be odd. $\square$

4 Almost Automorphic and Almost Periodic Minimal Flows

In this section, we investigate the conditions under which a minimal set of (1.2) is almost automorphic or almost periodic in the case that $f = f(t, u, u_x)$ (see Theorem 4.1). Moreover, we will also investigate the case that $f(t, u, p) = f(t, u, -p)$ (see Theorem 4.2).

Theorem 4.1. *Let M be a minimal set of (1.2).*

1. *If M is spatially homogeneous, then it is an almost 1-cover of $H(f)$.*
2. *If M is linearly stable, then M is spatially homogeneous; and hence, is an almost 1-cover of $H(f)$.*
3. *If M is uniformly stable, then M is spatially homogeneous and is a 1-cover of $H(f)$.*
4. *If M is hyperbolic (i.e., $\dim V^c(\omega) = 0$), then M is a 1-cover of $H(f)$.*

Proof. (1) Suppose that M is a spatially homogeneous minimal set of (1.2). Since $f = f(t, u, u_x)$, M is also a minimal set of

$$\dot{u} = \tilde{g}(t, u), \tag{4.1}$$

where $\tilde{g}(t, u) = g(t, u, 0)$ and $g \in H(f)$. It then follows from [28] that M is an almost 1-cover of $H(f)$.

(2) Suppose that M is spatially inhomogeneous. Then for any $(u, g) \in M$, u is spatially inhomogeneous.

Let $\Psi(t, v, (u, g)) = (\Phi(t, u, g)v, \Pi^t(u, g))$ be the linearized skew-product semiflow of M. By the exponentially separated property of the strongly monotone skew-product semiflows (see e.g. [28, p.38]), there is a continuous invariant splitting $X = X_1(u,g) \oplus X_2(u,g)$ with $X_1(u,g) = \mathrm{span}\{\phi(u,g)\}$, $\phi(u,g) \in \mathrm{Int}X^+$ and $X_2(u,g) \cap X^+ = \{0\}$ such that

$$\Phi(t,u,g)X_1(u,g) = X_1(\Pi^t(u,g)), \quad \Phi(t,u,g)X_2(u,g) \subset X_2(\Pi^t(u,g)).$$

Moreover, there are $K, \gamma > 0$ such that

$$\|\Phi(t,u,g)|_{X_2(u,g)}\| \le Ke^{-\gamma t}\|\Phi(t,u,v)|_{X_1(u,g)}\| \tag{4.2}$$

for any $t \ge 0$ and $(u,g) \in M$. Since M is linearly stable, one has

$$\limsup_{t\to\infty} \frac{\ln\|\Phi(t,u,g)\phi(u,g)\|}{t} \le 0.$$

Given any $(u_0,g_0) \in M$. Let $v(t,x) = \varphi_x(t,x;u_0,g_0)$. Then $||v(t,\cdot)||$ is bounded. Moreover, one can find a $\delta_0 > 0$ such that $\|v(t,\cdot)\| \ge \delta_0$ for all t. (Otherwise, there is a sequence $t_n \to \infty$ such that $\|v(t_n,\cdot)\| \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$, which entails that $\varphi_x(t_n,x;u,g) \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$ uniformly in $x \in S^1$. Without loss of generality, we assume that $(\varphi(t_n,\cdot;u,g), g\cdot t_n) \to (u^*,g^*) \in M$ as $n \to \infty$. Thus, u^* must be spatially homogeneous, a contradiction.) Therefore, we have $\lim_{t\to\infty} \frac{\ln\|v(t,\cdot)\|}{t} = 0$. Note also that $v(t,\cdot) = \Phi(t,u_0,g_0)v(0,\cdot)$. Then

$$\lim_{t\to\infty} \frac{\ln\|\Phi(t,u_0,g_0)v(0,\cdot)\|}{t} = 0. \tag{4.3}$$

As a consequence, we have $v(0,\cdot) = \alpha\phi(u_0,g_0) + \psi(u_0,g_0)$ for some $\alpha \ne 0$ and $\psi(u_0,g_0) \in X_2(u_0,g_0)$. It follows from (4.2) that $v(t,\cdot) \in \mathrm{Int}X^+ \cup (-\mathrm{Int}X^+)$ for t sufficiently large, a contradiction to the periodic boundary condition. Therefore, M is spatially homogeneous; and hence, M is an almost 1-1 cover of $H(f)$.

(3) Since M is uniformly stable, it then follows from Lemma 5.4 that M is linearly stable. By (1), M is almost 1-1 cover of $H(f)$. Note that the uniformly stability of M also implies that it is distal. Therefore, M is 1-cover of $H(f)$.

(4) Since $\dim V^c(\omega) = 0$, M must be spatially homogeneous. Otherwise, by (4.3), it is easy to see that $\dim V^c(\omega) \ge 1$. As a consequence, M is a hyperbolic minimal set of (4.1). By [25], M is a 1-1 cover of $H(f)$. □

In the following, we will consider the structure of the minimal set M for the case $f(t,u,p) = f(t,u,-p)$.

Theorem 4.2. *Assume that $f(t,u,p) = f(t,u,-p)$. Then any minimal set M of (1.3) is an almost 1-cover of $H(f)$.*

Moreover, M is a 1-cover of $H(f)$, if one of the following alternatives holds:

(i) *M is hyperbolic;*

(ii) $\dim V^c(\omega) = 1$ *and M is spatially inhomogeneous.*

Before proving Theorems 4.2, we present some lemmas. For convenience, we also write in the following the solution $\varphi(t,\cdot;u,g)$ as $\varphi(t;u_1,g)(\cdot)$ in the context without any confusion.

Let M be a minimal invariant set. For each $g\in H(f)$ and any $(u,g),(v,g)\in M\cap p^{-1}(g)$, we write

$$(u,g)\le_g(v,g)\Longleftrightarrow \text{ there is a } T>0 \text{ such that } (\varphi(t;u,g)-\varphi(t;v,g))(x_0)\le 0 \text{ for all } t\ge T.$$

Here $x_0\in S^1$ is a fixed point. Since $f(t,u,p)=f(t,u,-p)$, it follows from [3, Theorem B] that there is an $x_0\in S^1$ such that "$\le_g$" is a partial order on the fibre $M\cap p^{-1}(g)$, which means that, if $(u,g)\le_g(v,g)$ and $(v,g)\le_g(u,g)$, then $(u,g)=(v,g)$.

As usual, we say

$$(u,g)<_g(v,g)\Longleftrightarrow (u,g)\le_g(v,g) \text{ and } u\neq v.$$

We also call $(u,g)\ll_g(v,g)$ if there exist neighborhoods $\mathcal{N}_1,\mathcal{N}_2$ of (u,g) and (v,g), respectively, such that $(u_1,g)<_g(v_1,g)$ for any $(u_i,g)\in\mathcal{N}_1, i=1,2$.

Lemma 4.3. *Assume that $f(t,u,p)=f(t,u,-p)$. Then for any $g\in H(f)$ and $(u,g),(v,g)\in M\cap p^{-1}(g)$, one has*

(i) *$(u,g)<_g(v,g)$ if and only if there exists some $T>0$ such that*

$$(\varphi(t;u,g)-\varphi(t;v,g))(x_0)<0 \text{ for all } t\ge T.$$

(ii) *"$\le_g$" is a total ordering on $M\cap p^{-1}(g)$.*

Proof. (i) The sufficiency is obvious. If $(u,g)<_g(v,g)$, then $u\neq v$ and there exists a $T>0$ such that $(\varphi(t;u,g)-\varphi(t;v,g))(x_0)\le 0$ for all $t\ge T_0$. Choose a larger $T>0$, if necessary, one may also assume that $\varphi(t,\cdot;u,g)-\varphi(t,\cdot;v,g)$ only possesses simple zeros for each $t\ge T$. Then [3, Theorem B] immediately implies that $(\varphi(t;u,g)-\varphi(t;v,g))(x_0)<0$ for all $t\ge T_0$.

(ii) Given any two distinct $(u,g),(v,g)\in p^{-1}(g)\cap M$, one may find a $T>0$ such that $\varphi(t,\cdot;u,g)-\varphi(t,\cdot;v,g)$ only possesses simple zeros for each $t\ge T$. Without loss of generality, we assume that $(\varphi(T;u,g)-\varphi(T;v,g))(x_0)<0$. Then we have $(\varphi(t;u,g)-\varphi(t;v,g))(x_0)<0$ for all $t>T$. Otherwise, one can find a $t_0>T$ such that $(\varphi(t_0;u,g)-\varphi(t_0;v,g))(x_0)=0$. Together with [3, Theorem B], we get a contradiction. □

Lemma 4.4. *If M is almost 1-1 cover of $H(f)$, then M is 1-1 if and only if for any $g\in H(f)$, there exists $u\in X$ such that $M\cap p^{-1}(g)\subset(\Sigma u,g)$.*

Proof. We only need to prove the sufficiency part. Suppose that M is not a 1-1 cover. Then there exists some $g\in H(f)$ with two distinct points $(v_1,g),(v_2,g)\in M\cap p^{-1}(g)$. By our assumption, we have $\sigma_{\tilde a}v_1=v_2$ for some $\tilde a\in S^1$. Choose some other $g^*\in H(f)$ with $M\cap p^{-1}(g^*)\triangleq\{(w^*,g^*)\}$. The minimality of M implies that one can a sequence $t_n\to\infty$ such that $\Pi^{t_n}(v_1,g)\to(w^*,g^*)$, and hence, $\Pi^{t_n}(v_2,g)=\Pi^{t_n}(\sigma_{\tilde a}v_1,g)\to(\sigma_{\tilde a}w^*,g^*)$. This entails that $\sigma_{\tilde a}w^*=w^*$ (because $M\cap p^{-1}(g^*)=\{(w^*,g^*)\}$). On the other hand, one can also choose another sequence $s_n\to\infty$ such that $\Pi^{s_n}(w^*,g^*)\to(v_1,g)$. So $\Pi^{s_n}(\sigma_{\tilde a}w^*,g^*)\to(\sigma_{\tilde a}v_1,g)$. Recall that $\sigma_{\tilde a}w^*=w^*$, one has $\sigma_{\tilde a}v_1=v_1$. Thus we obtain that $v_2=v_1$, a contradiction. □

Proof of Theorem 4.2. Let Y_0 be the invariant residual set in Lemma 3.12. Suppose that there exists some $g_0 \in Y_0$ such that $\mathrm{card}(M \cap p^{-1}(g_0)) > 1$. Then we define

$$Z(g_0) := \min_{\substack{(u^1, g_0), (u^2, g_0) \in M \cap p^{-1}(g_0) \\ (u^1, g_0) \neq (u^2, g_0)}} \left\{ \inf_{t>0} z(\varphi(t, \cdot; u^1, g_0) - \varphi(t, \cdot; u^2, g_0)) \right\}. \tag{4.4}$$

By virtue of the definition z and Lemma 2.3(c), there exist $(\hat{u}^1, g_0), (\hat{u}^2, g_0) \in M \cap p^{-1}(g_0)$ and some $T > 0$ such that

$$Z(g_0) = z(\varphi(t, \cdot; \hat{u}^1, g_0) - \varphi(t, \cdot; \hat{u}^2, g_0)) \qquad \text{for all } t \geq T. \tag{4.5}$$

By Lemma 4.3(ii), we can assume without loss of generality that $(\hat{u}^1, g_0) <_{g_0} (\hat{u}^2, g_0)$, and hence,

$$(\varphi(t; \hat{u}^1, g_0) - \varphi(t; \hat{u}^2, g_0))(x_0) < 0 \qquad \text{for all } t \geq T.$$

Now we first claim that $(\hat{u}^1, g_0) \ll_{g_0} (\hat{u}^2, g_0)$. Indeed, fix the $T > 0$ in (4.5), it then follows from the continuity of z that there are neighborhoods $\tilde{\mathcal{N}}_1, \tilde{\mathcal{N}}_2$ of $(\hat{u}^1, g_0), (\hat{u}^2, g_0)$ in M respectively such that

$$\begin{array}{ll} \text{(i).} & z(\varphi(T, \cdot; u^1, g) - \varphi(T, \cdot; u^2, g)) \equiv Z(g_0); \\ \text{(ii).} & (\varphi(T; u^1, g) - \varphi(T; u^2, g))(x_0) < 0 \end{array} \tag{4.6}$$

for all $(u^i, g) \in \tilde{\mathcal{N}}_i (i = 1, 2)$. Let $\mathcal{N}_i = \tilde{\mathcal{N}}_i \cap p^{-1}(g_0)$, $(i = 1, 2)$. Then one has

$$\begin{array}{ll} \text{(i).} & z(\varphi(T, \cdot; u^1, g_0) - \varphi(T, \cdot; u^2, g_0)) \equiv Z(g_0); \\ \text{(ii).} & (\varphi(T; u^1, g_0) - \varphi(T; u^2, g_0))(x_0) < 0 \end{array} \tag{4.7}$$

for all $(u^i, g_0) \in \mathcal{N}_i (i = 1, 2)$. Suppose that there are some $(u^i, g_0) \in \mathcal{N}_i (i = 1, 2)$ with $(\varphi(T_1; u^1, g_0) - \varphi(T_1; u^2, g_0))(x_0) \geq 0$ for some $T_1 > T$. Then, from (4.7)(ii), one can find some $T_2 \in (T, T_1]$ such that $(\varphi(T_2; u^1, g_0) - \varphi(T_2; u^2, g_0))(x_0) = 0$. Recall that x_0 is the minimum point of any element in M (by [3, Theorem B]), then $\varphi_x(T_2; u^1, g_0)(x_0) = 0 = \varphi_x(T_2; u^2, g_0)(x_0)$. Thus, x_0 is a multiple zero of the function $\varphi(T_2, \cdot; u^1, g_0) - \varphi(T_2, \cdot; u^2, g_0)$. So, by virtue of (4.7)(i) and Lemma 2.3(b),

$$Z(g_0) = z(\varphi(T, \cdot; u^1, g_0) - \varphi(T, \cdot; u^2, g_0)) > z(\varphi(T_1, \cdot; u^1, g_0) - \varphi(T_1, \cdot; u^2, g_0)),$$

which contracts the minimum definition of $Z(g_0)$ in (4.4). As a consequence, $(\varphi(t; u^1, g_0) - \varphi(t; u^2, g_0))(x_0) < 0$ for all $t \geq T$ and $(u^i, g_0) \in \mathcal{N}_i (i = 1, 2)$. This implies, by Lemma 4.3(1), that $(u^1, g_0) <_{g_0} (u^2, g_0)$ for all $(u^i, g_0) \in \mathcal{N}_i (i = 1, 2)$. Thus we have proved the claim, i.e., $(\hat{u}^1, g_0) \ll_{g_0} (\hat{u}^2, g_0)$.

Moreover, we will prove that $(\hat{u}^1, g_0), (\hat{u}^2, g_0)$ forms a strongly order-preserving pair. To this end, we recall the neighborhoods $\tilde{\mathcal{N}}_1, \tilde{\mathcal{N}}_2$ obtained above. Let $(u^i, g_0) \in M \cap p^{-1}(g_0)$ with $\Pi^{t_0}(u^i, g_0) \in \tilde{\mathcal{N}}_i (i = 1, 2)$ for some $-T < t_0 < 0$. Then it follows from (4.6) and the cocycle property of φ that

$$\begin{array}{ll} \text{(i).} & z(\varphi(T + t_0, \cdot; u^1, g_0) - \varphi(T + t_0, \cdot; u^2, g_0)) \equiv Z(g_0); \\ \text{(ii).} & (\varphi(T + t_0; u^1, g_0) - \varphi(T + t_0; u^2, g_0))(x_0) < 0. \end{array} \tag{4.8}$$

By the same arguments as above, one has $(\varphi(t;u^1,g_0)-\varphi(t;u^2,g_0))(x_0)<0$ for all $t\geq t_0+T$, which implies that $(u^1,g_0)<_{g_0}(u^2,g_0)$. Thus, $(\hat{u}^1,g_0),(\hat{u}^2,g_0)$ forms a strongly order-preserving pair, contradicting Lemma 3.12. So, M is an almost 1-1 cover of $H(f)$.

Finally, we will show that M is a 1-1 cover of $H(f)$ under the assumption (i) or (ii).

(i) Assume that M is hyperbolic. Then this is a special case of Theorem 4.1(3).

(ii) Assume that M is $\dim V^c(\omega)=1$ and spatially inhomogeneous. Then it follows from Theorem 3.1(2) that, for any $g\in H(f)$, there is a $u\in X$, such that $M\cap p^{-1}(g)\subset\{(\Sigma u,g)\}$. Recall now that M is almost 1-1 cover of $H(f)$. Then Lemma 4.4 immediately implies M is 1-cover of $H(f)$. We have completed the proof. □

5 Embedding Property of Minimal Sets in the General Case

In this section, we focus on the embedding property of minimal set of general spatially-dependent almost-periodic system (1.1) with the smooth (say C^3) nonlinearity $f=f(t,x,u,u_x)$. The following two Theorems are our main results in this section.

Theorem 5.1. *Let $M\subset X\times H(f)$ be a minimal invariant set of Π^t. Assume that M is stable or linearly stable. Then there is an invariant and residual set $Y_0\subset H(f)$ such that the flow $(M\cap p^{-1}(Y_0),\Pi^t)$ is topologically conjugate to a skew-product flow on some $\hat{M}\subset\mathbb{R}^2\times Y_0$.*

Theorem 5.2. *Let $\mathcal{O}^+(u,g)$ be a uniformly stable forward orbit in $X\times H(f)$. Then the flow on its ω-limit set $\omega(u,g)$ is topologically conjugate to a skew-product flow on some $\tilde{M}\subset\mathbb{R}^2\times H(f)$.*

Remark 5.1. Theorems 5.1-5.2 have generalized the result of Tereščák [29] to time almost-periodic systems.

In order to prove the Theorem 5.1, we first prove the following two lemmas:

Lemma 5.3. *Let $M\subset X\times H(f)$ be a minimal set of Π^t which is linearly stable. Then there is an invariant and residual set $Y_0\subset H(f)$ such that for any $g\in Y_0$ and any two distinct elements $(v,g),(w,g)\in M\cap p^{-1}(g)$, one has*

$$z(\varphi(t,\cdot;v,g)-\varphi(t,\cdot;w,g))\equiv\text{constant},\quad \textit{for all } t\in\mathbb{R}. \tag{5.1}$$

Proof. Since K is linearly stable, it follows from [28, Theorem II.4.5] that there exist some integer $N\geq 1$ and some invariant residual set $Y_1\subset H(f)$ such that, for each $g\in Y_1$, $\text{card}(M\cap p^{-1}(g))=N$. Let $Y_0=Y_1\cap Y'$ where Y' is defined as in Lemma 2.1. Clearly, Y_0 is residual in Y. Then, for any $g\in Y_0$ and any $(v,g),(w,g)\in M\cap p^{-1}(g)$ with $v\neq w$, there is a sequence $\tau_n\to+\infty$ as $n\to\infty$ and $\{(v_n,g)\}\subset M\cap p^{-1}(g)$ such that $\Pi^{\tau_n}(w,g)\to(w,g)$ and $\Pi^{\tau_n}(v_n,g)\longrightarrow(v,g)$ as $n\to\infty$. Recall that $\text{card}(M\cap p^{-1}(g))=N<\infty$ for each $g\in Y_0$. One may assume without loss of generality that $v_n\equiv v_1$ for all $n\geq 1$. Consequently, one obtains $\Pi^{\tau_n}(v_1,g)\to(v,g)$ as $n\to\infty$. Thus, Lemma 2.4 implies the conclusion. □

Lemma 5.4. *Let $M \subset X \times H(f)$ be a minimal invariants set of the skew-product semiflow* (1.3) *generated by* (1.2). *If M is stable, then M is linearly stable.*

Proof. Assume that K is stable. Then for any $(u_0, g) \in K$, one has

$$\|\varphi(t, \cdot; u_1, g) - \varphi(t, \cdot; u_0, g)\| \ll 1 \quad \text{for } t \geq 0, \tag{5.2}$$

whenever $u_1 \in X$ with $\|u_1 - u_0\|$ being sufficiently small. Let $v(t,x) = \varphi(t,x;u_1,g) - \varphi(t,x;u_0,g)$. Then v satisfies

$$v_t = v_{xx} + a(t,x)v_x + b(t,x)v, \quad x \in S^1,$$

where

$$a(t,x) = \int_0^1 \partial_4 g(t,x,\varphi(t,x;u_0,g), \varphi_x(t,x;u_0,g) + s(\varphi_x(t,x;u_1,g) - \varphi_x(t,x;u_0,g)))ds$$

and

$$b(t,x) = \int_0^1 \partial_3 g(t,x,\varphi(t,x;u_0,g) + s(\varphi(t,x;u_1,g) - \varphi(t,x;u_0,g)), \varphi_x(t,x;u_1,g))ds.$$

Let

$$a_0(t) = \frac{1}{2\pi}\int_0^{2\pi} a(t,z)dz,$$

and

$$\psi(t,x) = \exp\Big(-\frac{1}{2}\int_0^x (a(t,z) - a_0(t))dz\Big).$$

Let $\tilde{v}(t,x) = \psi(t,x)v(t,x)$. Then $\tilde{v}$ satisfies

$$\tilde{v}_t = \tilde{v}_{xx} + a_0(t)\tilde{v}_x + \tilde{b}(t,x)\tilde{v}, \quad x \in S^1,$$

where

$$\tilde{b}(t,x) = b(t,x) + \frac{1}{2}\int_0^x [a(t,z) - a_0(t)]_t dz - \frac{1}{4}(a_0(t)^2 - a(t,x)^2) - \frac{1}{2}a_x(t,x). \tag{5.3}$$

Let also $\bar{v}(t,x) = \tilde{v}(t, x + c(t))$, where $\dot{c}(t) = -a_0(t)$. Then $\bar{v}$ satisfies

$$\bar{v}_t = \bar{v}_{xx} + \bar{b}(t,x)\bar{v}, \quad x \in S^1,$$

where $\bar{b}(t,x) = \tilde{b}(t, x + c(t))$ (see [8] for the transformations).

One can also consider the solution $v^0(t,x)$ of the variational equation

$$v_t = v_{xx} + a^0(t,x)v_x + b^0(t,x)v$$

with $v^0(0,x) = 1$, where

$$a^0(t,x) = \partial_4 g(t,x,\varphi(t,x;u_0,g), \varphi_x(t,x;u_0,g))$$

and

$$b^0(t,x) = \partial_3 g(t,x,\varphi(t,x;u_0,g),\varphi_x(t,x;u_0,g))).$$

By the similar transformations as above, we can also obtain that $\bar{v}_0(t,x)$ satisfies

$$\bar{v}_t = \bar{v}_{xx} + \bar{b}^0(t,x)\bar{v}, \quad x \in S^1$$

with $\bar{b}^0(t,x) = \tilde{b}^0(t,x+c^0(t))$, where

$$\tilde{b}^0(t,x) = b^0(t,x) + \frac{1}{2}\int_0^x [a^0(t,z) - a_0^0(t)]_t dz - \frac{1}{4}(a_0^0(t)^2 - a^0(t,x)^2) - \frac{1}{2}a_x^0(t,x) \tag{5.4}$$

with $\dot{c}^0(t) = -a_0^0(t)$ and $a_0^0(t) = \frac{1}{2\pi}\int_0^{2\pi} a^0(t,z)dz$.

By (5.2), it is clear that $|a(t,x) - a^0(t,x)|$ and $|b(t,x) - b^0(t,x)|$ are sufficiently small for any $t \geq 0$, whenever the initial value $\|u_1 - u_0\|$ is sufficiently small. Moreover, by a priori estimates for parabolic equations, one can obtain that $|a_t(t,x) - a_t^0(t,x)|$ and $|a_x(t,x) - a_x^0(t,x)|$ are sufficiently small for any $t \geq 0$, provided that the initial value $||u_0 - u_1||_{C^3(S^1)}$ is sufficiently small.

So, for any $\epsilon > 0$, one can choose some $u_1 \in X$ with $u_1 - u_0 \in \mathrm{Int}X^+$ and $||u_0 - u_1||_{C^3(S^1)}$ sufficiently small such that

$$\tilde{b}(t,\cdot) - \epsilon \leq \tilde{b}^0(t,\cdot) \leq \tilde{b}(t,\cdot) + \epsilon, \quad \text{for} \quad t \geq 0,$$

where $\tilde{b}(t,\cdot), \tilde{b}^0(t,\cdot)$ are defined in (5.3)-(5.4). Hence,

$$\bar{b}(t,\cdot) - \epsilon \leq \bar{b}^0(t,\cdot) \leq \bar{b}(t,\cdot) + \epsilon, \quad \text{for} \quad t \geq 0. \tag{5.5}$$

As a consequence,

$$-Ce^{-\epsilon t}\bar{v}(t,\cdot) \leq \bar{v}^0(t,\cdot) \leq Ce^{\epsilon t}\bar{v}(t,\cdot) \quad \forall t \geq 0,$$

where $C > 0$ is such that $-C\bar{v}(0,\cdot) \leq \bar{v}^0(0,\cdot) \leq C\bar{v}(0,\cdot)$. Observe also that $||\bar{v}(t,x)||$ is bounded for all $t \geq 0$. It then follows that

$$\limsup_{t\to\infty} \frac{\ln\|\Phi(t,u_0,g)\|}{t} \leq \epsilon.$$

By arbitrariness of ϵ, we have $\lambda_K \leq 0$. □

Proof of Theorem 5.1. Due to Lemma 5.4, we only need to consider the case that M is linearly stable. Fix some $x_0 \in S^1$, we define the following mapping:

$$\chi : M(\subset X \times H(f)) \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}^2 \times H(f); (v,g) \longmapsto (v(x_0), v_x(x_0), g). \tag{5.6}$$

Clearly, χ is continuous and onto $\chi(M) \subset \mathbb{R}^2 \times H(f)$. Moreover, we can obtain that $\chi|_{M\cap p^{-1}(Y_0)}$ is injective, where $Y_0 \subset H(f)$ is defined in Lemma 5.3. In fact, choose any $g \in Y_0$ and two distinct elements $(v,g),(w,g) \in M\cap p^{-1}(g)$. It then follows from Lemma 5.3 that $z(\varphi(t,\cdot;v,g)-$

$\varphi(t,\cdot;w,g)) \equiv$ constant for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$. So, $v - w \in X$ possesses only simple zero. Therefore, $(v(x_0), v_x(x_0)) \neq (w(x_0), w_x(x_0))$, which implies that $\chi(v,g) \neq \chi(w,g)$, and hence, $\chi|_{M\cap p^{-1}(Y_0)}$ is injective.

Let $\hat{M} \triangleq \{\chi(v,g) \in \chi(M) : g \in Y_0\} \subset \mathbb{R}^2 \times Y_0$. Since $\chi|_{M\cap p^{-1}(Y_0)}$ is injective and onto $\hat{M}$, Π^t naturally induces a (skew-product) flow $\hat{\Pi}^t$ on $\hat{M}$ as:

$$\hat{\Pi}^t(\chi(v,g)) \triangleq \chi(\varphi(t,\cdot;v,g), g\cdot t) \quad \text{for any } \chi(v,g) \in \hat{M}. \tag{5.7}$$

We will show that the map $(\chi|_{M\cap p^{-1}(Y_0)})^{-1}$ is also continuous from $\hat{M}$ to $M \cap p^{-1}(Y_0)$. Indeed, let $\chi(v^n, g^n) \to \chi(v,g)$ in $\hat{M}$ (that is, $(v^n(x_0), v_x^n(x_0), g^n) \to (v(x_0), v_x(x_0), g)$ with $g^n \to g$ in Y_0). By the compactness of M, one may assume without loss of generality that $(v^n, g^n) \to (w, g) \in M$. This then implies that $(v(x_0), v_x(x_0)) = (w(x_0), w_x(x_0))$. Recall that $(v,g), (w,g) \in M$ with $g \in Y_0$. Suppose that $v \neq w$. Then Lemma 5.3 implies that $v - w$ possesses only simple zero, a contradiction. Consequently, $v = w$, and hence, $(v^n, g^n) \to (v,g) \in M$. Thus, we have proved $(\chi|_{M\cap p^{-1}(Y_0)})^{-1}$ is continuous from $\hat{M}$ to $M \cap p^{-1}(Y_0)$. By virtue of (5.7), $(M \cap p^{-1}(Y_0), \Pi^t)$ is topologically conjugate to the flow $(\hat{M}, \hat{\Pi}^t)$ on $\mathbb{R}^2 \times Y_0$. ☐

Proof of Theorem 5.2. Since $(H(f), \mathbb{R})$ is minimal and distal, the ω-limit set $\omega(u,g)$ of the semi-orbit $\mathcal{O}^+(u,g)$ for the skew-product semiflow Π^t is a minimal set which admits a distal flow extension (See [28, Theorem II.2.8]). It then follows from [28, Theorem I.2.6] that the residual set $Y_0 = H(f)$. So, it follows from Theorem 5.1 that $\omega(u,g)$ is topologically conjugate to a skew-product flow on some $\tilde{M} \subset \mathbb{R}^2 \times H(f)$. ☐

References

[1] S. Angenent, The zero set of a solution of a parabolic equation, J. reine angew. Math **390** (1988), 79–96.

[2] S. Angenent and B. Fiedler, The dynamics of rotating waves in scalar reaction diffusion equations, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **307** (1988), 545–568.

[3] X. Chen and H. Matano, Convergence, asymptotic periodicity, and finite-point blow-up in one-dimensional semilinear heat equations, J. Diff. Eqns. **78** (1989), 160-190.

[4] P. Chernoff and J. Marsden, On continuity and smoothness of group actions, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. **76** (1970), 1044-1049.

[5] R. Czaja and C. Rocha, Transversality in scalar reaction-diffusion equations on a circle, J. Diff. Eqns. **245** (2008), 692-721.

[6] S. Chow, and H. Levia,Dynamical spectrum for time dependent linear systems in Banach spaces, Japan J. Indust. Appl. Math., **11** (1994),379-415

[7] S. Chow, X. Lin, and K. Lu, Smooth invariant foliations in infinite-dimensional spaces, J. Diff. Eqns. **94** (1991), 266-291.

[8] S. Chow, K. Lu, and J. Mallet-paret, Floquet bundles for scalar parabolic equations, Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal., **129** (1995), 245-304.

[9] S. Chow and Y. Yi, Center manifold and stability for skew-product flows, J. Dynam. Differential Equations, **6** (1994), 543-582.

[10] B. Fiedler and J. Mallet-Paret, A poincaré-bendixson theorem for scalar reaction diffusion equations, Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal. **107** (1989), 325-345.

[11] J.K. Hale, Asymptotic behavior of dissipative systems, Mathematical surveys and monographs, Vol. 25, Amer. Math. Soc., 1988.

[12] D. Henry, Geometric Theory of Semilinear Parabolic Equations, Lecture Notes Mathematics Vol.840, New York, Springer, 1981.

[13] W. Huang and Y. Yi, Almost periodically forced circle flows, J. Funct. Anal. 257(2009), 832-902.

[14] J. Mallet-Paret and H. Smith, The Poincare-Bendixson theorem for monotone cyclic feedback systems, J. Dyn. Diff. Eqns. **2** (1990), 367-421.

[15] R. Joly and G. Raugel, Generic hyperbolicity of equilibria and periodic orbits of the parabolic equation on the circle, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **362** (2010), 5189-5211.

[16] R. Joly and G. Raugel, Generic Morse-Smale property for the parabolic equation on the circle, Annal. Institute Henri Poincaré, Analyse Non Linéaire **27** (2010), 1397-1440.

[17] P. Massatt, The Convergence of solutions of scalar reaction diffusion equations with convection to periodic solutions, Preprint, 1986.

[18] H. Matano, Nonincrease of the lap-number of a solution for a one-dimensional semi-linear parabolic equation, J. Fac. Sci. Univ. Tokyo Sect.IA. **29** (1982), 401-441.

[19] H. Matano, Asymptotic behavior of solutions of semilinear heat equations on S^1, Nonlinear Diffusion Equations and Their Equilibrium States II (W.-M. Ni, L.A. Peletier, and James Serrin, eds.), Mathematical Sciences Research Institute Publications, vol. 13, Springer US, 1988, 139-162.

[20] R. Sacker and G. Sell, A spectral theory for linear differential systems, J. Diff. Eqns. **27** (1978), 320-358.

[21] R. Sacker and G. Sell, Dichotomies for linear evolutionary equations in Banach spaces, J. Diff. Eqns. **113** (1991), 17-67.

[22] B. Sandstede and B. Fiedler, Dynamics of periodically forced parabolic equations on the circle, Ergodic Theory and Dynamical Systems **12** (1992), 559–571.

[23] G. Sell, Topological dynamics and ordinary differential equations, Van Nostrand Reinhold Co., Van Nostrand Reinhold Mathematical Studies, No.33. 1971.

[24] W. Shen and Y. Yi, Dynamics of almost periodic scalar parabolic equations, J. Diff. Eqns. **122** (1995), 114-136.

[25] W. Shen and Y. Yi, Asymptotic almost periodicity of scalar parabolic equations with almost periodic time dependence, J. Diff. Eqns. **122** (1995), 373-397.

[26] W. Shen and Y. Yi, On Minimal Sets of Scalar Parabolic Equations with Skew-product Structures, Tran. Amer. Math. Soc., **347** (1995), 4413-4431.

[27] W. Shen and Y. Yi, Ergodicity of minimal sets in scalar parabolic equations, J. Dyn. Diff. Eqns. **8** (1996), 299-323.

[28] W. Shen and Y. Yi, Almost automorphic and almost periodic dynamics in skew-product semiflows, Mem. Amer. Math. Soc. **136** (1998), no. 647.

[29] I. Tereščák, Dynamical systems with discrete Lyapunov functionals, Ph.D. thesis, Comenius University (1994).

[30] Y. Wang, Asymptotic symmetry in strongly monotone skew-product semiflows with applications, Nonlinearity **22** (2009), 765-782.